DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 342 326 HE 025 300

TITLE	Choosing South Carolina's Future: A Plan for Higher Education in the 1990's.
INSTITUTION	South Carolina Commission on Higher Education, Columbia.
PUB DATE	11 Jul 91
NOTE	106p.; Attachment 1 contains filled type and will reproduce poorly.
AVAILABLE FROM	South Carolina Commission on Higher Education, 1333 Main Street, Suite 300, Columbia, SC 29201.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; Access to Education; Accountability; College School Cooperation; Educational Quality; Educational Trends; Futures (of Society); *Higher Education; Long Range Planning; Private Colleges; State Aid; State Boards of Education; State Colleges; State Legislation; State Standards; *Statewide Planning; Trend Analysis
IDENTIFIERS	*South Carolina

ABSTRACT

This document is the state-wide strategic plan for public and private higher education in the 1990s in South Carolina. The plan was developed in response to the State Legislative Act 629, "The Cutting Edge." The plan rests on three principles: (1) ensuring access to education to all South Carolinians at whatever levels of student preparation and readiness; (2) ensuring real student growth and achievement; and (3) making the higher education system and its institutions more accountable to the public. These principles are reflected in four areas of priority: developing partnerships; expanding participation and achievement; improving quality and accountability; and establishing a continuous, shared planning process for higher education. The report itself is organized into two sections with the first outlining the plan and the second providing supporting materials. The section outlining the plan opens with a review of the context for planning, including past legislation, current commissions and institutions, and the environment for education in the state. There follows a detailed discussion of the four priorities, and an action plan for 1991-92, a suggested outline for implementation of initiatives, and identification of continuing issues and topics for consideration. The section of supporting materials contains a statement of mission; a report on trends affecting higher education in South Carolina (which includes 42 references); and task force reports on enrollment, collaboration, and quality (also with 42 references). (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED342326

Choosing South Carolina's Future: A Plan for Higher Education in the 1990's

July 11, 1991

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
SC Commission on Higher Education
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

In the end, it is important to remember that we cannot become what we need to be by remaining what we are.

M. Dupree
Leadership is an Art

South Carolina Commission on Higher Education
1333 Main Street, Suite 300
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

(803) 253-6260

HE 025 300

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CHOOSING SOUTH CAROLINA'S FUTURE:
A PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE 1990's

July 11, 1991

In the end, it is important to remember that we cannot become what we need to be by remaining what we are.

M. Dupree
Leadership is an Art

SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

1333 MAIN STREET

SUITE 300

COLUMBIA, S. C. 29201

FRED R. SHEHEEN
Commissioner

TELEPHONE
803/253-6260

FAX NUMBER
803/253-6267

July 11, 1991

Dear Citizens of South Carolina:

As Chairman of the Commission on Higher Education, I am pleased to present South Carolina's first strategic statewide plan, ***Choosing South Carolina's Future: A Plan for Higher Education in the 1990's***, which was adopted by the full Commission on Higher Education on July 11, 1991. Developed collaboratively by the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education and the higher education institutions in the State, this plan describes several areas of emphasis for the 90's.

The State's system of higher education is committed to improving not only the life of the individual student but also the quality of life of ***all*** South Carolinians. Higher education belongs to you, the citizens of the State, and those of us charged with maintaining a system of excellence in higher education take very seriously our responsibility to you and to the spirit and history of South Carolina.

Whether through educating South Carolinians for life and jobs, improving health care through research and training, or attracting new business and industry in order to secure jobs for the State, higher education benefits ***all*** South Carolinians. Thus, ***all*** South Carolinians should take a keen interest in its future. We ask for your help in creating a future of which all South Carolinians can be proud.

This plan, which will guide us through the '90s, will be updated annually to ensure that higher education meets the most pressing needs of the State. We live in an increasingly competitive world, and our State must ensure that our educational system provides our students with the kinds of skills they will need for the twenty-first century. Only by making deliberate choices, as we do in this plan, can we begin to secure the kind of future we want.

Of course, a plan is not a reality until it is acted upon. Higher education must be a priority for the Governor, the legislature, the business community, and all South Carolinians. The level of this support will determine the strides we as a State can make before the twenty-first century is upon us.

Sincerely,

William J. Whitener

William J. Whitener, Chairman

PREFACE

In June 1988, through passage of legislative Act 629, known as ***The Cutting Edge*** legislation, the State of South Carolina took a bold step forward in improving the quality of higher education. Article VII of Act 629 is dedicated to "improving accountability through planning and assessment" and directs the Commission on Higher Education (CHE) to "...maintain a statewide planning system to address strategic issues in public and private higher education." To fulfill this legislative mandate, the statewide planning system must (1) identify future directions for higher education in South Carolina and recommend appropriate methods for meeting the resultant challenges; (2) review major goals identified by the public and private institutions of higher learning in this State and ascertain their relationship to higher education; (3) assure the maintenance and continued development of the quality of higher education in South Carolina; and (4) assure the maintenance and continued provision of access to and equality of educational opportunity in higher education in South Carolina.

Recognizing that we cannot move forward in all directions at once, the Commission on Higher Education and the State's public colleges and universities chose to develop a strategic plan rather than a master plan. Strategic planning enables us to make difficult choices by focusing on a limited number of issues that are critical to effecting real change. The process of determining a strategy and those issues and themes around which it will be built has been called a "matching process." Strategies emerge from achieving a "match" among three components: (1) mission and values (2) internal strengths and weaknesses, and (3) external opportunities and threats. Strategic planning takes the environment into account and encourages building on strengths while minimizing weaknesses.

Based on planning reports prepared for the CHE by all public institutions, surveys, and an understanding of the environment, three key issues of immediate importance to the future of higher education in South Carolina were identified: enrollment, quality, and collaboration. Task forces were established to study these issues and to develop concrete strategies to address them. This document reflects the findings of the strategic planning process to date.

Structured to permit annual updating, the plan is comprised of objectives and strategies related to several priorities that must be addressed aggressively in order to guide the State toward higher levels of quality and distinction. These priorities will, no doubt, remain priorities for several years; through future cycles of strategic planning, we will identify other areas of principal concern. The continuous nature of this planning process will allow us to review, adjust, and refine our plan on an annual basis. This plan will be implemented by the institutions and the Commission on Higher Education, with support from the legislature and the citizens of South Carolina. It will serve as a critical link in communicating to South Carolina residents and interested parties throughout the nation the direction that South Carolina higher education is taking to meet the challenges that lie ahead. By setting and achieving ambitious goals, we can choose the future of South Carolina rather than remain passive victims of change.

Executive Summary

Legislative Act 629, ***The Cutting Edge*** legislation, directs the Commission on Higher Education to "maintain a statewide planning system to address strategic issues in public and private education." In response to this legislation, the Commission on Higher Education, the Council of Presidents, and the institutions have developed this statewide planning document for the higher education system in the 1990s -- the State's first "strategic" plan for higher education. This plan, which articulates our vision for the future of South Carolina's higher education system, rests on several principles: ensuring access to all South Carolinians at whatever level they seek services; ensuring student retention appropriate to differing levels of student preparation and readiness; ensuring real student growth and achievement; and making the higher education system and its institutions more accountable to the public. These principles are reflected in the **four areas of priority** identified for attention in this plan:

> Recognizing that higher education alone cannot resolve problems related to quality, participation and achievement, and funding, South Carolina's colleges and universities will expand their partnerships with kindergarten through grade 12 (K-12), business and industry, and other higher education institutions. Such partnerships help ensure an educational network of quality to educate the State's citizenry and to develop the State's economy.

Meeting the challenges of scarce resources and increased demands on our educational system will require a coordinated effort at sharing resources not only with other educational institutions but also with the private sector and government. Higher education benefits everyone, and we must work together to encourage more of our citizens to seek education beyond high school and throughout life.

> Given that vast numbers of South Carolinians remain undereducated, the State's colleges and universities will work to expand participation and achievement in higher education.

Despite the State's laudable strides in improving geographic access and the availability of academic programs for all South Carolinians, real participation in higher education lags behind both national and regional averages. We must increase the college-going rate of our citizens, and in particular, encourage more black students to pursue higher education.

> Recognizing that only educational programs of high quality can lead South Carolina to a better future, the State's colleges and universities will improve their effectiveness and demonstrate this improvement to the Governor, the legislature, the business community, and the State's citizens.

Our colleges and universities must provide South Carolinians with quality educations. A well-educated citizenry will allow the State to remain economically competitive and to improve dramatically the quality of life. To garner fully the benefits of higher education for South Carolinians, we must ensure that we use our resources as efficiently as possible. We must also recognize that no program of "quality incentives," no matter how attractive, can substitute for "full formula funding" as the single most effective way to improve the quality of our public institutions.

In order to continue moving forward in improving the effectiveness of higher education in South Carolina, the Commission on Higher Education, the Council of Presidents, and the institutions will develop a permanent mechanism to ensure continuous planning and assessment.

Plans are of little value unless the goals they set are achieved in a timely fashion. Similarly, the commendable aims described in ***The Cutting Edge*** legislation will remain unfulfilled unless a permanent mechanism for planning is established.

Table of Contents

I. **Choosing South Carolina's Future: A Plan for Higher Education in the 1990s**

Introduction 1

The Context for Planning

The Mission and Goals of Higher Education in South Carolina 3

The Commission on Higher Education and the Institutions 4

The Environment 5

Planning for Excellence 6

Planning Priorities

Developing Partnerships 7

Expanding Participation and Achievement 10

Improving Quality and Accountability 12

Establishing a Continuous, Shared Planning Process for Higher Education 15

Action Plan for 1991-92 19

Suggested Outline for Implementation of Initiatives 21

Continuing Issues 23

Topics for Future Consideration 25

II. **Supporting Materials**

The Mission of the Commission on Higher Education 29

Trends Affecting the Future of Higher Education: An Environmental Scan.....31

Task Force Reports

Enrollment 63

Collaboration 87

Quality 105

INTRODUCTION

In his 1971 inaugural address, Governor John C. West lashed out at "the tyranny of limited expectations" in the state of South Carolina. Twenty years later, South Carolinians must still confront the fact that vast numbers of us will be educationally inferior to citizens of more prosperous states that recognize the necessity of higher education for their citizens. A recent report from the National Governors' Association's task force on education, co-chaired by Governor Carroll Campbell, maintains that we must change the way we think and "abandon the view that only a small proportion of our population must be well educated, that many can get by with less knowledge and fewer skills."[1]

In 1986, South Carolina's participation rate in higher education was 11 percent, compared to a regional rate of 13 percent and a national rate of 15.6 percent. In other words, the State's participation rate was 30 percent lower than the national rate and 15 percent lower than the regional rate.

The low educational achievement of many South Carolinians directly affects the quality of life in the State. Nearly 20 percent of South Carolinians live in poverty. Each year over a quarter of births in the State are to unmarried women, and the infant mortality rate is among the nation's highest. South Carolina's incarceration rate is 52 percent higher than the national rate, and over 80 percent of prisoners are high school dropouts. South Carolina's life expectancy rate is forty-ninth in the nation.

Coupled with the facts that jobs will continue to require higher levels of education and that rapidly changing technology will demand frequent retraining of workers, the present weaknesses will be magnified over the coming decade. The critical juncture at which we stand is not a new one. As the turn of the century comes into view, we must act.

We must refuse to accept the limited expectations of the past. We must begin to think differently about seemingly immovable barriers. We must change the language of progress from "meeting regional averages" or "catching up with rest of the nation" to "leadership" and "excellence." We must set ambitious goals. Most importantly, we must garner the collective will of the people of South Carolina to achieve these goals and to change the future of our state.

There can be a better South Carolina: one that surpasses the economic growth and development of recent years; one that improves dramatically the quality of human life for its citizens; one in which its citizens partake in lifelong education; one that harnesses the full array of human talent to improve life for all South Carolinians. As catalysts for change, South Carolina's colleges and universities stand ready to work for a better South Carolina.

---

[1] Educating America: ***State Strategies for Achieving the National Education Goals***. National Governors' Association, 1990.

The Context for Planning

The Mission and Goals of Higher Education in South Carolina

Broadly stated, the primary mission of the State's higher education system is to provide for the intellectual, cultural, and social development of the State's citizens; to advance the State's economic growth and development; to improve the quality of life for South Carolinians; and to provide the critical leadership necessary to address the State's persistent social and economic problems. This mission is reflected in nine goals first set out in the 1979 ***South Carolina Master Plan for Higher Education***:

(1) To provide the opportunity for learning beyond the secondary school level for all who need it or seek it. In their 1986 study, ***Higher Education in South Carolina: An Agenda for the Future***, Augenblick Van de Water and Associates (AVA) commended South Carolina for its "high degree of access to higher education, particularly in terms of the geographic distribution of institutions." Despite this progress, the need persists to increase participation.

(2) To reduce the socio-economic barriers to postsecondary education. During the 1980s, public institutions operated under federal and then state mandates to eliminate vestiges of segregation and to improve access and equity. Despite these efforts and the establishment of several new scholarship programs, the last decade has seen minimal improvement in minority student participation at our public institutions. To improve access and equity for minority students, the percentage of costs of public higher education borne by students must be lowered.

(3) To assure the most effective and efficient use of all resources. Recognizing that State resources are increasingly scarce, nearly all the State's public institutions have developed external funding sources while serving as good stewards of the State's fiscal and financial resources. Instances of poor stewardship have been addressed, and the Commission and the public colleges and universities reaffirm their commitment to fiscal and academic accountability.

(4) To improve the quality of post-secondary education. The AVA study recommended that "the Commission on Higher Education make the assessment of the quality of higher education a major objective of the coming years." In 1989, the Commission and the institutions initiated an institutionally based assessment process focusing on improvement rather than on data collection.

(5) To encourage research activity within post-secondary education. During the last decade, the Legislature, the Commission, and the institutions have encouraged faculty research, particularly as it relates to economic development. While strongly reaffirming this goal, the Commission and the colleges and universities seek a responsible balance between teaching and research appropriate to each institution's stated mission.

(6) To make better use of the resources of post-secondary education in public service. Recognizing that faculty are their most important resource, South

Carolina's public institutions are committed to involving their faculties further in public service activities aimed at improving the cultural, social, and economic well-being of the State.

(7) To achieve and sustain among the citizens of the State an appreciation for the accomplishments of post-secondary education and an understanding of its commitment to improving the quality of life. The AVA study concluded that while South Carolinians recognize and support the roles that higher education plays in economic development and in the vocational success of individuals, they do not appear to recognize the intrinsic value of higher education in improving the quality of life in the State.

(8) To preserve a strong non-public sector of post-secondary education. Some of South Carolina's independent colleges and universities have attained national reputations for excellence, and public higher education recognizes the vital contributions made by these institutions. The high degree of state support for these institutions demonstrates our commitment to assist them in carrying out their missions effectively.

(9) To work cooperatively with all segments of education in the State. Given that the objective of all those engaged in education must be the improvement of the learning process, cooperative working relationships across all levels of education in South Carolina should be forged.

The above goals reflect the overall mission of higher education in the State. Given their general nature, these goals can best be achieved through focused planning efforts such as the current one which identifies a limited number of specific objectives and strategies.

The Commission on Higher Education and the Institutions

Working in concert, the Commission on Higher Education and the State's institutions of higher education seek to create an environment in which each institution can pursue its own mission within the broader statewide framework. The Commission, consisting of 18 lay members supported by a professional staff, serves the citizens of the State by promoting quality and efficiency in the state system of higher education. Its efforts are directed toward promoting a clearer understanding of and greater unity among all institutions of higher learning, both public and private, in the interest of serving the higher education needs of South Carolina.

The missions of South Carolina's 62 public and independent post-secondary institutions vary widely. Research universities offer degree programs through the doctoral level and professional programs consistent with their respective missions. In addition, their missions emphasize funded research and public service activities that complement academic programs. Within the context of their variety of roles and missions, senior colleges offer a broad range of degree programs including graduate programs at the master's degree level in selected fields as well as public service and research programs. South Carolina's 21 public two-year colleges consist of five campuses of the University of South Carolina and 16 technical colleges. All of these institutions offer programs up to and including the associate degree as well

as shorter programs that may lead to certificates or diplomas in occupational education. During the 1991-92 planning cycle, the Commission and the institutions will work together to examine and, where necessary, clarify mission statements for the public institutions.

The independent sector of South Carolina higher education consists of 29 colleges and universities. Of these, 22 are senior institutions and seven are two-year colleges. Of the two-year colleges, four are profit-making institutions.

The Environment

Effective planning demands consideration of the social, economic, technological, and demographic changes we should expect in the future. Accordingly, one of the initial steps in this planning process was the development of an environmental scan containing data on selected trends that affect higher education in South Carolina (see Section II--Supporting Materials). Although we can do nothing to change external forces, we can anticipate their effects and use them to our advantage whenever possible. As we plan for higher education over the next decade, the following data from the scan are particularly important:

* South Carolina's population will continue to grow, although the growth will be geographically uneven. Between 1985 and 2000, the State's projected population growth rate is 15.4%, while coastal region populations will increase 70% to 90% during the 1990's.

* While the proportion of citizens 65 and older is expected to increase, the proportion of college-aged citizens is expected to decline. In the year 2000, approximately 15% of the State's population will be aged 15-24, a smaller percentage than at any time during the twentieth century.

* The proportion of nonwhites to whites in South Carolina's population aged 18 to 65 is expected to shift slightly, with nonwhites increasing from 29% to 33% of that population.

* In 1985 South Carolina's college participation rate of 110 per 1000 population lagged behind both the southern region and the nation. Without an increase in the rates of college participation, the number of high school graduates entering college will decline by approximately 11% in the 1990's.

* Employment in South Carolina will grow by about 24% between 1986 and 2000, slower than the southern region but faster than the nation as a whole. In the states of the Southern Regional Development Board (SREB), approximately 64% of these new workers will be women and approximately 23% will be non-white. By 2000, South Carolina's total work force will be about 30% non-white.

* The average job in the Southeast region will require about 14 years of education by the year 2000. Although over 50% of the new jobs created in the South by that year will require some post-secondary study and approximately 33% will require a college degrees, only about 38% of South Carolinians will have completed some education beyond high school (assuming no change in college participation rates).

* A significant portion of jobs in South Carolina are connected to U. S. affiliates of foreign companies. In 1988 such companies accounted for 23.5 jobs per 1000 population in the nation.

* Serious social problems in South Carolina are expected to persist. With approximately 346 federal and state prisoners per 100,000 people in 1986, South Carolina's incarceration rate is among the nation's highest. Over 80% of South Carolina's prisoners are high school dropouts. The Department of Youth Services reported a 54% increase of referrals over 1984. In 1985 26% of births in the State were to unmarried women.

Planning for Excellence

Through a shared and dynamic strategic planning process, the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education and the Council of Presidents are providing the strong leadership that our state must have for the 1990s. Both the Commission on Higher Education and the Advisory Council on Planning will review institutional missions and plans of public colleges and universities as they are developed in response to this statewide plan. The State's independent colleges and universities have the opportunity to participate in planning for the future of higher education through their representation on the Advisory Council on Planning. These reviewing groups will address program growth and duplication as well as institutional accountability.

Our vision for the future of South Carolina's higher education system rests on several principles: ensuring access to all South Carolinians at whatever level they seek services; ensuring student retention appropriate to differing levels of student preparation and readiness; ensuring real student growth and achievement; and making the higher education system and its institutions more accountable to the public.

Implementing this plan will be possible only if the role of higher education is carefully defined, clearly focused, and closely integrated with the other forces that are essential for change, including the Governor, the legislature, the business community, and the citizens of South Carolina. In particular, we recognize that our goals cannot be achieved without adequate resources, and we encourage the legislature to support higher education as it seeks a better future for the State.

A new spirit of cooperation now exists throughout the higher education system in South Carolina. We must encourage this spirit so that higher education institutions can work together to improve the quality of life for our state's citizens. Given the magnitude of our challenge, there is plenty for each institution to do, be it teaching our citizens, producing research to advance economic development, training the work force, or promoting outreach that directly addresses technical, social, and economic problems of the State.

Planning Priorities

What follows is a strategic vision -- a set of common ends to pursue -- built around four priorities for planning over the next decade: developing partnerships, expanding participation and achievement, improving quality and accountability, and establishing a continuous, shared planning process for higher education. Under each of these four broad priorities, we list specific **objectives** and **strategies**, several of which are already underway, some of which will be implemented as part of the 1991-92 Action Plan, and a number of which will be pursued in future years. In addition, accountability is built into the plan's structure through the inclusion of key **indicators of progress** in implementing the plan.

PRIORITY: Developing Partnerships

Recognizing that higher education alone cannot resolve problems related to quality, participation and achievement, and funding, South Carolina's universities will expand their partnerships with kindergarten through grade 12 (K-12), business and industry, other higher education institutions, and the South Carolina Legislature. Such partnerships help ensure an educational network of quality to educate the State's citizenry and to develop the State's economy.

Partnerships can enhance quality at every level of the educational system by expanding opportunities for communication, problem solving, and the sharing of expertise. Given the interdependent relationship between K-12 and post-secondary education, collaborative efforts will encourage South Carolinians to view our educational system as a network with clear points of convergence rather than as a series of discrete parts with distinct borders. Such efforts will break down unnecessary barriers that prevent our state's citizens from participating and achieving in education beyond high school and throughout life. The recent establishment of the Council for Educational Collaboration and the South Carolina Curriculum Congress are important steps in forging this critical partnership.

As a partner with government, business, and industry, South Carolina's higher education system will work to strengthen economic development by preparing graduates for the workplace, conducting basic and applied research, and providing leadership for resolving economic development problems. Partnerships between higher education and business and industry will demonstrate the importance of higher education and establish its value in vocational success. By 2000, we will achieve the following objectives:

Partnerships with K-12

(1) **Articulate curricular expectations to ensure successful transitions for students from pre-school through higher education.**

Strategy**
Develop curricular and instructional continuity in K-12 through college education and establish regular reviews of curricula to ensure this continuity; explore alternative teaching, learning, and assessment methods with emphasis on educational technology and its applications; effect faculty exchanges between K-12 and higher education.

Indicators of Progress
a statewide system of discipline-based and multi-disciplinary alliances of school and college faculty modeled after those proposed by the American Association for Higher Education and the College Board; success of the S.C. Curriculum Congress

(2) **Increase high school graduation rates, especially for minority students.**

Strategy
Establish a State endowment to provide annual incentives and awards to high schools and school districts achieving a high level of or improvement in minority matriculation to post-secondary education.

Strategy*
Develop college-based intervention programs in elementary and middle schools.

Strategy*
Establish additional programs to improve science and mathematics skills of minority students.

Indicators of Progress
implementation of appropriate programs for teacher preparation and of effective means for reforming science and math curricula

Partnerships with Business and Industry

(1) **Develop and strengthen relationships between the private sector and higher education to prepare students for specific vocational and technical responsibilities and to ensure a competitive workforce.**

Strategy*
Effect stronger ties between faculty and business professionals.

Indicators of Progress
cooperative training and management seminars keyed to business, industrial, and professional needs and coordinated by the educational institutions

* Activity in progress. ** To be initiated in 1991-92 Action Plan

Strategy**
With the support of business leaders (Higher Education Blue Ribbon Committee) and the expertise of a public relations firm, develop a statewide public information campaign to increase awareness of the importance of education in the lives of individual South Carolinians.

Indicators of Progress
efforts by institutions to supply information on educational opportunities available to employees of companies wishing to locate in S.C.; development of educational T.V. materials on research and education

(2) **Work with industry to increase support for both basic and applied research that has the potential to enhance the State's economic development and improve the quality of life for all citizens.**

Strategy*
Identify opportunities for research and development pertinent to the missions of both the public and private sectors.

Indicators of Progress
outreach by institutions to bring businesses into existing consortia and to develop new consortia; enhanced ties among the universities and colleges in order to provide training and communication between the public and private sector; examples of such outreach and consortia include the Southeast Manufacturing Technology Center (SMTC) and the Rapid Acquisition of Manufactured Parts program (RAMP), which deliver advanced manufacturing technology to small businesses in the State

Strategy
Work with industry to establish a mechanism for providing matching funds so that State institutions can compete with comparable institutions in other states for their share of federal research dollars.

Indicators of Progress
legislation establishing a State matching funds account

Strategy*
Expand support for higher education/industry ventures that move new technologies into the marketplace and improve the competitiveness of S.C. industry.

Indicators of Progress
use by business community of resources available within institutions, including faculty expertise and advanced equipment; use by institutions of expertise and resources available in business and industry to strengthen the curriculum; establishment of centers for developing businesses

* Activity in progress.

** To be initiated in 1991-92 Action Plan.

Partnerships with other Higher Education Institutions

(1) **Forge stronger partnerships among South Carolina's research universities as well as among these institutions and other national research institutions.**

Strategy*
Develop new consortia and maintain existing consortia between S.C. research universities to satisfy federal agency mandates or to address national problems such as hazardous waste and environmental restoration.

Indicators of Progress
continue support for the South Carolina Universities Research and Education Foundation (SCUREF)

(2) **Foster cooperation among the State's public and private institutions.**

Strategy**
Develop and implement articulation agreements among public and private two-year and senior colleges and universities.

Strategy*
Establish agreements among higher education institutions to share resources such as faculty and facilities to enrich educational opportunity and to avoid unnecessary duplication.

Strategy
Organize a coordinated working group of representatives from the Commission on Higher Education, the public and private institutions, and business and industry for the purpose of influencing systematically public policy toward higher education in South Carolina.

PRIORITY: **Expanding Participation and Achievement**

Given that vast numbers of South Carolinians remain undereducated, the State's colleges and universities will work to expand participation and achievement in higher education.

Despite significant progress in geographic accessibility, South Carolina, in comparison with other states, remains "undereducated" in nearly every population category. This fact is particularly troubling given that the State's economic, social, political, and cultural well-being in the next century depend to a large degree on its ability to educate far more South Carolinians than ever before. Despite the shrinking pool of 15 to 24-year olds, we must increase the number of high school graduates and improve the collegiate participation rate. Although some of the goals below may appear to be ambitious given recent patterns of participation and achievement in higher education, they must be achieved if South Carolina is to move forward. By 2000, we will achieve the following objectives:

* Activity in progress. ** To be initiated in 1991-92 Action Plan.

Participation

(1) **Increase the college-going rate of high school seniors from 50 to 65 percent.**

Strategy**
Establish a need-based student bond bill--similar to the World War II "G.I. Bill"--to invest in human capital and guarantee access to higher education for all qualified South Carolinians.

Strategy
Encourage collaboration with elementary and secondary schools by establishing a statewide network of high school guidance counselors and higher education admissions officers to promote early educational planning by parents and students.

(2) **Increase the number of black students in higher education from the current 19 percent of enrollment to 30 percent.**

Strategy**
Establish a need-based student bond bill.

Strategy*
Establish articulation agreements between two-year institutions and high schools and between four-year institutions and two-year institutions.

(3) **Increase by 200 percent the transfer rate of students with associate degrees to four-year institutions.**

Strategy**
Expand collaborative relationships among two-year, four-year, and graduate institutions.

Indicators of Progress
implementation of articulation agreements and establishment of academic alliances of school and college faculty

Achievement

(1) **By 1994, increase by eight percent the current institutional averages for the retention rates of undergraduates between the first and second years of enrollment.**

Strategy**
Establish regular reviews of curricula to ensure continuity between secondary and post-secondary education; examine teaching strategies addressing how students learn; explore alternative teaching, learning, and assessment methods with emphasis on educational technology and its applications; promote K-12 and higher education faculty exchanges.

* Activity in progress. ** To be initiated in 1991-92 Action Plan.

Indicators of Progress
Implementation of a statewide system of discipline-based and multi-disciplinary academic alliances of school and college faculty modeled after those proposed by the American Association for Higher Education and the College Board.

(2) **Increase the number of South Carolinians with four years or more of higher education from approximately 13 percent to 20 percent of the State's population aged 34 and older.**

Strategy**
Establish a student bond bill; develop articulation agreements; develop programs to improve academic advising and career counseling; and improve retention rates.

Strategy
Establish computer assisted advisory programs.

(3) **Increase by 20 percent the number of graduate degrees awarded by South Carolina's institutions of higher learning.**

Strategy
Provide necessary financial support to help graduate students complete their degrees.

Indicators of Progress
statewide loan program for legal residents of South Carolina to attend State institutions; expansion of Cutting Edge graduate incentive fellowship program

PRIORITY: Improving Quality and Accountability

Recognizing that only educational programs of high quality can lead South Carolina to a better future, the State's colleges and universities will improve their effectiveness and demonstrate this improvement to the Governor, the legislature, the business community, and the State's citizens.

South Carolinians must be confident that the graduates of their colleges and universities are awarded diplomas that signify not only the fulfillment of requirements but also achievement of real merit and the acquisition of essential skills, critical knowledge, and a willingness to continue learning throughout life. Given that all institutional functions can affect student learning and faculty effectiveness, we must broaden our concept of quality to apply not only to learning but also to improving performance at every level of the academic and administrative enterprise. South Carolina's institutions also have a responsibility to preserve the State's investment through good stewardship of financial and physical resources. Accordingly, our institutions must continue to be accountable to our citizens. By 2000, we will achieve the following objectives:

* Activity in progress. ** To be initiated in 1991-92 Action Plan.

Quality Programs

(1) **Attract and retain excellent faculty in the State despite the national shortage of doctorally-trained faculty over the next decade.**

Strategy
Strengthen faculty salaries and benefits packages to levels in line with peer institutions.

Indicators of Progress
increased appropriations from the State to improve faculty salary and benefits

Strategy
Increase funding of *Cutting Edge* program to fund endowed chairs and professorships.

Indicators of Progress
provision of sufficient matching state funds via *The Cutting Edge* program; securing of institutional matching funds through private sources

(2) **Improve educational achievement at the undergraduate level.**

Strategy
Establish a statewide program to improve the teaching/learning process and the curriculum.

Strategy*
Measure student learning through multiple assessment methods and use the results for program improvement.

(3) **Enhance the quality of graduate education in the State.**

Strategy
Improve communication and cooperation among graduate schools in South Carolina.

Indicators of Progress
establishment of a Council of South Carolina Graduate Schools to facilitate joint programs, cooperative research, student exchange, and compatible regulations

Strategy
Revise state funding formula to recognize the unique library, computing, and facilities needs of graduate education and research.

(4) **Strengthen the public service efforts of higher education that are aimed at improving the State's quality of life.**

* Activity in progress. ** To be initiated in 1991-92 Action Plan.

Strategy
Assemble up-to-date statewide listings of public service needs suitable for thesis or dissertation research or faculty research grants.

Quality and Accountability

(1) **Demonstrate the effective use of public resources in higher education by ensuring the accountability of the Commission on Higher Education and the institutions.**

Strategy*
Evaluate the effectiveness of the Commission on Higher Education as called for in the assessment plan developed by the Commission.

Indicator of Progress
public report by external consultants on the CHE's effectiveness based on its mission statement, goals or objectives, and measurable indicators

Strategy
Strengthen the CHE's program review process to include greater emphasis on student learning.

Indicators of Progress
demonstrated improvement in student learning as a result of program review

Strategy*
Ensure that a sound, strategic, institutional-level plan exists at each institution and that institutions report regularly on their use of financial and physical resources in its support.

Indicators of Progress
demonstration that strategic planning is being used to reallocate existing resources at each institution to areas of strength that are central to its missions

Strategy*
Establish a comprehensive effectiveness program at each higher education institution.

Indicators of Progress
full implementation of the Institutional Effectiveness Plan by the CHE

(2) Secure a stable funding base to allow institutions to plan effectively and to ensure programs of high academic quality.

Strategy**
Demonstrate the essential role of higher education in the State's economic development and quality of life through a statewide public information campaign.

* . Activity in progress. ** To be initiated in 1991-92 Action Plan.

Strategy**
To augment the Commission on Higher Education's Institutional Effectiveness Program, modify the appropriations formula to address quality incentives and accountability.

Indicators of Progress
as recommended by the Task Force on Quality, establish a committee (consisting of three members each from the Advisory Committee on Business and Finance, the Academic Affairs Advisory Committee, and the CHE staff) to develop an equitable set of quality and accountability incentives that can be built into the formula and to establish a level of formula funding at which these incentives will become operable

Strategy
Identify a dedicated revenue source for support of basic needs of S.C. higher education.

PRIORITY: **Establishing a Continuous, Shared Planning Process for Higher Education**

In order to continue moving forward in improving the effectiveness of higher education in South Carolina, we must develop a permanent mechanism to ensure continuous planning and assessment.

This process will provide for cooperative study of higher education issues by the Commission on Higher Education, the Advisory Council on Planning, and the Council of Presidents. The Advisory Council on Planning, which consists of the Council of Presidents, three presidents of private institutions, and the Commissioner of Higher Education (who presides as chair), will serve as the vehicle for participation by the State's public and private institutions.

(1) **South Carolina must anticipate and prepare for the growth in enrollment required to achieve the goals of increased participation and achievement in higher education.**

Strategy*
Annually, institutional representatives and members of the Commission staff will update enrollment projections. The Commission will use the 1994 enrollment projections as a basis for planning. However, as 1994 approaches, projected enrollments beyond that year will be reexamined and adjustments may be made as part of the on-going planning process.

* Activity in progress. ** To be initiated in 1991-92 Action Plan.

Full-Time Equivalent and Headcount Enrollment by Institution, Actual and Projected

Institution	Actual Enrollment Fall 1990		Projected Enrollment Fall 1994	
Undergraduate Enrollment	**FTE**	**Headcount**	**FTE**	**Headcount**
Clemson	13,481	13,010	13,600	13,125
College of Charleston	6,007	6,663	7,042	7,824
Francis Marion	3,260	3,687	3,536	4,000
Lander	2,054	2,309	2,085	2,450
MUSC		1,003	798	1,050
SC State	4,442	4,615	5,568	5,800
The Citadel	2,571	2,335	2,753	2,500
USC-Aiken	2,193	2,966	2,484	3,431
USC-Coastal	3,396	4,080	3,820	4,773
USC-Columbia	14,714	16,017	15,351	16,811
USC-Spartanburg	2,681	3,501	3,038	4,050
Winthrop	3,852	4,173	4,150	4,500
USC University Campuses	2,837	4,339	3,433	5,294
State Board for Technical & Comprehensive Education	33,078	45,509	40,553	56,021
Total Undergraduate Enrollment	94,566	114,207	108,211	131,629
First Professional Enrollment				
Medical University of SC	778	778	780	780
USC-Columbia	1,235	1,089	1,357	1,247
Total First Professional	2,013	1,867	2,137	2,027

Institution	Actual Enrollment Fall 1990		Projected Enrollment Fall 1994	
Graduate Enrollment	**FTE**	**Headcount**	**FTE**	**Headcount**
Clemson	2,193	3,293	3,211	4,822
College of Charleston	354	1,063	475	1,500
Francis Marion	78	239	88	271
Lander	86	333	90	350
MUSC		438	303	458
SC State	156	333	256	547
The Citadel	471	1,465	525	1,625
USC-System	5,122	8,507	5,636	9,788
Winthrop	444	931	640	1,350
Total Graduate Enrollment	8,904	16,602	11,224	20,711

(2) **Ensure the timely implementation of this plan.**

Strategy*
Monitor progress made in achieving the objectives set forth in the statewide plan.

Indicators of Progress
a clear statement of the roles and responsibilities of the institutions and the Commission on Higher Education in implementing the statewide plan; implementation of annual action plan within the year

(3) **Enhance the effectiveness of the planning process described in *The Cutting Edge* legislation.**

Strategy*
Seek closer collaboration between the Council of Presidents, institutions, and the Commission on Higher Education to accomplish the following steps of each planning cycle: annual revision of the plan by the Advisory Council on Planning and the Council of Presidents or its designated committee, in consultation with Commission staff; annual updates of scan to identify issues for study by task forces consisting of Commission and institutional representatives.

Strategy**
Develop a clear description of the methods to be used in evaluating the effectiveness of the planning process.

(4) **Address issues related to mission differentiation.**

Strategy**
Establish a shared process by which the Commission on Higher Education and the institutions review and differentiate institutional missions.

Indicators of Progress
agreement by the CHE and the Council of Presidents that this process is equitable

* Activity in Progress. ** To be initiated in 1991-92 Action Plan.

The statewide plan is intended to express a common set of expectations for higher education. It makes public our commitment to improving South Carolina's future. Each year, the Commission on Higher Education and the institutions will revise the plan, determine appropriate objectives to be pursued in the coming year, and set out the year's action plan. Through this annual consultative process, we will achieve our vision for the future of higher education. The action plan below identifies initiatives to be pursued in the first cycle of planning.

Action Plan for 1991-92

Initiatives	Responsible Agents	Priority Addressed
(1)		
Establishment of a statewide system of discipline-based alliances of school and college faculty to achieve curricular continuity in K-12 and higher education	Public schools, higher education institutions, State Department of Education, Commission on Higher Education	Developing Partnerships, Expanding Participation and Achievement
(2)		
Establishment of a coordinated statewide system of alliances between colleges and universities and business and industry	Commission on Higher Education and higher education institutions	Developing Partnerships
(3)		
Development of a statewide public information campaign to increase awareness of the importance of higher education to South Carolinians and to influence favorably public policy toward higher education in the State	Council of Presidents, Commission on Higher Education, Presidents of private institutions, and a public relations agency	Developing Partnerships, Expanding Participation and Achievement, Improving Quality and Accountability
(4)		
Development and implementation of articulation agreements among private and public two-year and senior colleges and universities	Commission on Higher Education and higher education institutions	Developing Partnerships, Expanding Participation and Achievement

(5)		
Establishment of a need-based student bond bill and implementation plan guaranteeing access to higher education	Commission on Higher Education and higher education institutions	Expanding Participation and Achievement
(6)		
Modification of appropriations formula to include quality and accountability incentives	Commission on Higher Education and higher education institutions	Improving Quality and Accountability
(7)		
Development of a clear description of methods to be used in evaluating the effectiveness of the Statewide planning process	Commission on Higher Education and higher education institutions	Establishing a Continuous, Shared Planning Process for Higher Education
(8)		
Establishment of a shared process by which the Commission on Higher Education and the institutions review and differentiate missions	Commission on Higher Education and higher education institutions	Establishing a Continuous, Shared Planning Process for Higher Education
(9)		
Creation of a working group to influence systematically public policy toward higher education in South Carolina	Commission on Higher Education, Council of Presidents, Presidents of private institutions, leaders of business and industry	Developing Partnerships

Suggested Outline for Implementation of Initiatives

Initiative 1: Academic Alliances

July 15: Council for Educational Collaboration begins to design plan for integrating selected areas of curriculum in K-12 and higher education

Sept. 15: Initiate pilot programs

May 15: Evaluate results of pilot programs; make recommendations for possible expansion of program

Initiative 2: Alliances between colleges/universities and business and industry

July 15: The CHE, colleges and universities, and State Development Board work together to develop plans and mechanisms to strengthen both business and industry and higher education through collaboratives. Further actions to depend on result of such discussion

Initiative 3: Public Information Campaign

To be determined by Council of Presidents and Presidents of private institutions

Initiative 4: Articulation Agreements

July 15: Advisory Committee on Academic Programs appoints ad hoc committee consisting of members from that group and from the CHE staff; Committee begins review of existing articulation agreements and develops suggested changes and additions to the statewide articulation agreements

March 15: Advisory Committee on Academic Programs makes recommendations to Standing Committee on Academic Programs

April 15: Standing Committee on Academic Programs makes recommendations to the full Commission

Initiative 5: Student Bond Bill

July 15: CHE appoints ad hoc committee to oversee development of the student bond bill program; ad hoc committee begins to design student bond bill program

Dec. 15: CHE acts on proposed student bond bill

Jan. 15: Draft legislation introduced; institutional and CHE representatives speak on behalf of bill

Initiative 6: Quality Incentives

July 15: Establish ad hoc committee to design an equitable package of quality incentives for incorporation into funding formula for 1993-94 as specified in task force report on quality

Nov. 1: Draft incentives sent to the Advisory Council on Business and Finance and the Advisory Committee on Academic Programs for review

Dec. 15: Revise as necessary

Feb. 15: CHE acts on final committee report

Initiative 7: Evaluation of Planning Process

July 15: Standing Committee on Planning and Assessment develops criteria to evaluate planning process

Oct. 15: Elicit institutional responses to proposed criteria

Nov. 15: Revise as necessary based on institutional response

Jan. 15: Standing Committee on Planning and Assessment presents to full Commission

April 15: Standing Committee on Planning and Assessment conducts initial evaluation of plan according to criteria

Initiative 8: Establishment of a Shared Process for Mission Differentiation

July 15: Advisory Council on Planning begins developing alternative processes to address issues related to mission differentiation

Oct. 15: Elicit institutional responses to proposed processes

Dec. 15: Present a process for mission review and differentiation to be adopted by the Standing Committee on Planning and Assessment

Jan. 15: Standing Committee on Planning and Assessment presents process to full Commission

Initiative 9: Creation of an Advocacy Group on Public Policy

Sept. 15 CHE, Council of Presidents, presidents of private institutions, leaders of business and industry identify representatives to a working group on public policy affecting higher education

CONTINUING ISSUES

Certain issues periodically reappear in the media, the General Assembly, or other appropriate forums. These issues were not dealt with in this planning process, because the Commission on Higher Education has already taken formal policy positions based on earlier studies. The following paragraphs describe the Commission's position with regard to two of those issues.

Engineering Education

The sixteen technical colleges, Francis Marion College, and South Carolina State College offer programs in engineering technology, while The Citadel, Clemson University, and the University of South Carolina at Columbia offer programs in engineering. Because of the high cost of engineering programs, there have been occasional questions about unnecessary duplication in this area, particularly at the graduate level. Program duplication and demand for engineering graduates were two issues examined by a team of eight external consultants employed by the Commission in 1986. In their March 1987 ***Review of Engineering and Engineering Technology Programs in South Carolina Public Institutions of Higher Learning***, the consultants concluded that "all engineering and engineering technology programs in the state should continue, as they are vital to the state and its citizens." In considering duplication in specific engineering programs at the graduate level (i.e., Chemical, Civil, Electrical, Computer, and Mechanical Engineering at Clemson University and USC-Columbia), the consultants stated repeatedly that the programs were separated geographically and existed in regions with "significant concentrations of industry." Moreover, the consultants consistently found graduate engineering programs at both universities to contribute "significantly to the educational and research needs of the State of South Carolina and the nation." The Commission on Higher Education is convinced that current engineering programs do not constitute unnecessary duplication, and finds that given the demand for highly qualified engineers, the State's engineering programs are providing an essential service.

Medical Education

Medical Education, like that in engineering, is both expensive and important to the well being of the citizenry of the State. While both the Medical University of South Carolina (MUSC) and the University of South Carolina School of Medicine are needed, the public and the General Assembly are often confused by the apparent lack of differentiation between their missions. Broadly stated, the mission of both medical schools is to improve the health of the people of South Carolina through medical education, research, and the delivery of health care. However, the College of Medicine at the Medical University of South Carolina is an integral component of a major free-standing academic health sciences center with the associated broad spectrum of schools, colleges, and institutional facilities for clinical training, including a teaching hospital. MUSC is a major center for medical research and tertiary care, and offers a wide variety of specialized residencies. The School of Medicine at the University of South Carolina is a relatively new community-based medical school that also has strengths in teaching, research, and clinical

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

service, and offers the usual array of departments and options to its medical students. However, its fundamental orientation is towards an especially strong emphasis on primary care at the undergraduate level, and particularly at the graduate level. High quality primary care residencies and attractive medical school experiences focus on family practice, psychiatry, internal medicine, pediatrics, obstetrics and gynecology, and to some extent emergency medicine. The major clinical research orientation should generally be focused on those areas that are part of the primary care emphasis of the school. In short, the differences between the Medical University of South Carolina and the School of Medicine at the University of South Carolina cannot be stated in absolutes, but must be recognized, accepted and preserved as matters of emphases.

Topics for Future Consideration

During the 1991-92 planning cycle, the Commission and the institutions will work on two major projects: (1) institutional mission statements will be examined and, as necessary, clarified. As part of this task, the Commission and the institutions may consider a reclassification (definition by type) of institutions into four categories, such as research universities, comprehensive colleges and universities, baccalaureate colleges, and two-year colleges; (2) the Commission and the institutions will work together during the next year to assess the effectiveness of the recently modified Access and Equity Program.

In addition, joint task forces will study several issues related to improving the management of higher education in the State. These issues include: (1) the potential conversion from regional to national peer groups; (2) State funding and institutional spending patterns; (3) a review of existing administrative procedures and State regulations that may be inappropriate to public higher education agencies, including such issues as fiscal and operational autonomy, payment of State taxes, interest withheld on student monies, and the optional retirement program; and (4) consideration of a personnel classification and compensation system appropriate to higher education. Addressing these issues will help ensure that higher education in South Carolina operates in the most efficient and effective way possible.

The following two topics continue to require attention from the Commission on Higher Education and other policymaking bodies in South Carolina. They must be considered on a continuing basis.

System Expansion

The Commission on Higher Education consistently experiences pressures for expansion of the public college and university system. Independent colleges seek to become public colleges, public senior colleges desire to expand graduate offerings, and two-year colleges want to become baccalaureate institutions. These matters will be included in future cycles of state-wide planning.

Two-Year Education

After extensive study, the Commission on Higher Education approved the addition of Associate in Arts and Associate in Science degree programs at all remaining technical colleges effective in the Fall of 1990. The decision to make all technical colleges comprehensive institutions generated a great deal of debate and concern, and was accompanied by a requirement that the State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education submit annually for the next five years an evaluation of the programs, a description of the characteristics of students enrolled, and an assessment of the impact of the programs at neighboring colleges. The Commission will review the report annually and make additional decisions in light thereof about the organizational structure and programming in the two-year public colleges.

Supporting Materials

The Mission of the Commission on Higher Education

Trends Affecting the Future of Higher Education: An Environmental Scan

Task Force Reports

- Enrollment
- Collaboration
- Quality Incentives

The Mission of the Commission on Higher Education

The responsibilities of the Commission on Higher Education are specifically delineated in Sections 59-103-20 through 59-103-150, 59-104-10 through 59-104-660, 59-46-10 through 59-46-250, and such other sections of the Code of Laws of South Carolina as may be pertinent. On January 4, 1990, the Commission approved a plan to assess its own effectiveness that included the following brief mission statement:

> The South Carolina Commission on Higher Education is a higher education coordinating board consisting of eighteen lay members supported by a professional staff. Broadly defined, its mission is to serve the citizens of the State by promoting quality and efficiency in the state system of higher education. More specifically, its purpose is to develop plans; conduct studies; approve new academic programs; administer certain state, regional, and federal programs; make recommendations concerning requests for appropriations and capital improvements; promote access to higher education; and carry out those other duties required by its enabling legislation or other statutes. Its efforts are directed toward the promotion of a clearer understanding of and greater unity among all institutions of higher learning, both public and private, in the interest of serving the higher education needs of South Carolina.

TRENDS AFFECTING THE FUTURE OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN SOUTH CAROLINA: AN ENVIRONMENTAL SCAN

March 25, 1991

Preface

As we plan for the future of higher education in South Carolina, we must consider anew its purposes and goals. These purposes and goals are shaped by values shared by all institutions of higher learning in the state: the importance of ensuring that education beyond high school is accessible to all South Carolinians who desire it; the vital contribution that higher education institutions must continue to make to the state's economic and cultural development; and the critical leadership responsibilities of these institutions in resolving the state's persistent social, economic, and health problems. While these values form the fundamental context within which planning for higher education must occur, successful planning demands consideration of the social, economic, technological, and demographic changes we should expect in the coming years.

This report contains a survey of data on selected trends that affect the higher education environment in South Carolina. Although we can do nothing to change these forces which act upon us, our purpose in anticipating trends is to intervene and mitigate their influence on higher education in South Carolina. The plan for higher education that will result from this process will attempt to set our direction and address these environmental facts in ways that allow the state of South Carolina to choose--rather than just accept--its future. Clearly, choosing the best future for South Carolina will require carefull planning within the context of these trends. Set against a changing national environment, these data suggest that the needs for higher education in the future in South Carolina will be greater than ever before because of dramatic changes that will occur over the next decade:

- South Carolina's population will grow older and more diverse.
- There will be more part-time and returning students, but fewer traditional students, in higher education.
- Restructuring of the economy will continue, with most new jobs being added in the service sector.
- Jobs will require higher levels of education.

- Most new entrants to the labor force will be women and minorities.
- Rapidly changing technology will require frequent retraining.
- International economic competition will increase.

Because higher education in South Carolina affects directly so many aspects of life--social, economic, cultural, technological, and political--the state's higher education institutions carry much of the responsibility for leadership today as well as in the 21st century. Rapid change will ensure that the demand for individuals who can think clearly, communicate readily, and adapt to change will continue to increase. With widely varying missions, these institutions are well-suited to fulfill the state's needs, whether through teaching its citizens, through producing first-rate research to advance economic development, through training its work force, or through outreach that directly addresses technical, social, and economic problems. Higher education in each of these areas must be encouraged to advance the state's well-being.

Obviously, higher education cannot solve all of the state's problems, but it can serve as a primary catalyst to begin working out solutions. Our post-secondary system holds enormous knowledge and talent, such as the visionary leadership of our university and college presidents. Building on collaborative structures that already exist throughout higher education and forming new ones when necessary, institutions of higher learning can have a fundamental impact on the quality of the lives of the citizens of South Carolina.

For example, the state's economic, social, political, and cultural well-being in the next century will depend, in large measure, on its ability to reverse the low participation rate in higher education. Higher education, in collaboration with K through 12, other state agencies, and the private sector can influence participation rates of the citizens of South Carolina. Working directly with elementary and secondary schools, for example, we can help to increase graduation rates, ensure that college-bound students are prepared for college level work, and strengthen early admission programs for extraordinary students. Working with industry and

trade associations, we can help to shape and support apprenticeship and other critical training programs for students who are not college bound. Our organized research units can form partnerships with agencies and policy makers to address fundamental problems of the environment, health, and poverty. Our business schools can expand their outreach programs to help build sound entrepreneurial opportunities for those who traditionally have not had access to the American dream. Through these and other collaborative efforts, not even yet conceived, higher education can work to improve its own future as well as the future of the next generation of South Carolinians.

While the data presented in this analysis provide a basic context for examining higher education in the state, they by no means represent a comprehensive analysis of the state's environment for higher education. As statewide planning progresses, additional areas will be monitored periodically. Among the areas for future analysis are the following:

- Federal and state policy related to higher education
- External environment for research
- Financing of higher education
- Relative roles of public/private sectors
- Role of higher education in fulfilling needs of the private sector
- Higher education management
- Trends in the K through 12 system

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface

Introduction 5

Looking Toward the Future: South Carolina and the Nation 7

Some Observations on Challenges and Opportunities 14

Sources 21

ENVIRONMENTAL SCAN

Introduction

The objective of this environmental scan is to provide a survey of readily available data on selected trends that shape the environment for post-secondary and higher education in South Carolina. Whenever possible, South Carolina trends are set against a backdrop of national trends. It should be emphasized that the data reported here are not intended to paint a complete picture of the higher education environment. Rather, the scan has sought to capture major trends in areas that are obviously related to immediate higher education concerns. As the strategic planning process for post-secondary education continues to develop in South Carolina, both the range and depth of the environmental scanning process should be expanded.

Systematic assessment of the environment is a critical component of the strategic planning process. Thus, we hope this document will serve as a foundation upon which to build a continuing and effective environmental scanning process. This scan is divided into two major parts. Part one presents data which, taken together, describe key components of the nation and our state as it is today and as it is likely to be in the future. In general, the data presented focus on the relatively near term. We chose this approach because the availability and reliability of data, as well as our ability to respond to identified challenges, decline markedly beyond a five to ten-year period. The data presented in part one focus on five principal topics: population, education, the economy, labor force, and poverty/social concerns.

Part two of the scan offers some observations that may help to relate the trends identified in part one to three topics critical to the future of higher education in South Carolina: enrollment, quality, and collaboration between post-secondary and K through 12 educational systems. Although it is certainly not the only factor, changes in population affect the enrollment

issue, while the issue of quality in higher education is a reflection of changes in our economy and increasing international competition. The need for collaboration between our K through 12 educational system and higher education is related to both enrollment and quality concerns, but largely grows out of the changing demands on our labor force.

Data and observations reported here draw heavily on earlier work completed by the Office of Institutional Research at the University of South Carolina and the Institute of Public Affairs; resource materials provided by the state Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education and the Commission on Higher Education; and comments and critiques from Clemson University, College of Charleston, Francis Marion College, USC-Lancaster, and The Citadel. Throughout the text of the scan, the term "higher education" is used to describe a range of post-secondary educational experiences including community colleges, technical schools, senior colleges, and universities.

Looking Toward the Future: South Carolina and the Nation

While the future is always uncertain, current trends indicate that South Carolina and the nation will change dramatically in the next century. Some of those changes include the following:

WE WILL BE OLDER

- In 1980, the median age of Americans was 30.6 (an all-time high); by 2000 it will be 36.6 (Parnell[1]).
- From 1987 to 1997, the 18-24 year old population will decline by 12% nationally (NCES[2]).
- Between 1985 and 2000 the national population 65 years old and older will increase 21.4% (SREB[3]).
- By 2000, there will be 4.9 million people age 85 and over in the U.S. (Cetron and Davies[4]).
- The proportion of South Carolina's citizen's 65 and older will have grown 36.4% between 1985 and 2000, while its college-age citizens will have declined 8% (*SC Statistical Abstract*[5]).
- In the year 2000, approximately 15% of South Carolina's population will be between the ages of 15 and 24, smaller than at any time during the 20th century (HSSCL[6]).
- The population 55 years of age or older will comprise one quarter of South Carolina's population in 2010 (*SC Statistical Abstract*[5]).
- The state's proportion of the population 85 years or older will grow from about .8% of the population in 1985 to 2.2% in 2010. Over 100,000 South Carolinians are expected to be 85 years old or older in 2010 (*SC Statistical Abstract*[5]).
- By 2010, nearly half of the state's population 60 and over are expected to reside in the state's coastal counties (SC Commission on Aging[7]).

WE WILL HAVE GEOGRAPHICALLY UNEVEN POPULATION GROWTH

- Between 1985 and 2000, the projected U.S. population growth rate is 12.3% (SREB[3]).
- After 1995, the population of the United States will grow more slowly than ever and may stop growing by about 2040 (USBC[8]).
- In 1950, the national birth rate per 1,000 population was 24.1; in 1985 it was 15.7; by the year 2000 it will be 13 (World Future Society[9]).
- During the past decade, South Carolina's growth rate exceeded 10%, surpassing the growth rate of the United States as a whole and keeping pace with the rest of the South (SREB[3]).
- Between 1985 and 2000, the state's projected population growth rate is 15.4% (SREB[3]).
- Between now and 2000, Coastal region populations, including Horry, Dorchester, Berkeley, and Beaufort counties will increase 70% to 90% (HSSCL[6]).

WE WILL BE MORE DIVERSE

- By the year 2000, one out of every four Americans will be Hispanic, African-American, Asian or Middle Eastern (Cetron and Davies[4]).
- By 2000 non-whites (blacks, asians, and American Indians) will comprise 16.9% of the U.S. population (SREB[3]).
- By the year 2000, Hispanics will represent over 12% of the U.S. population under the age of 17 (SREB[3]).
- The national birth rate for white females is 1.7 children, compared to 2.4 for blacks and 2.9 for Mexican-Americans (Hodgkinson[10]).
- In 1985, South Carolina's nonwhite population (composed primarily of African-Americans) comprised 31.6% of the total population, compared to 15.2% in the United States as a whole and 20.2% in southern states. The proportion of nonwhites to whites in the population is expected to remain relatively stable through the year 2000 (SREB[3]).
- In South Carolina, the distribution of whites and nonwhites across age groups is expected to shift slightly by 2000. In 1985 nonwhites comprised approximately 26% of the population 65 and over, by 2000 that proportion will decline to about 22%. In 1985, nonwhites comprised 29% of the population 18 to 65; by 2000 that proportion is expected to increase to about 33% (*SC Statistical Abstract*[5]).

THERE WILL BE FEWER TRADITIONAL STUDENTS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

- National enrollment in higher education institutions will remain constant or increase slightly until 1992. Assuming no change in rates of college participation, the number of students enrolled in higher education institutions will decline by 400,000 between 1992 and 1997, approximately 10-12%. The number of students younger that 25 who are enrolled will decrease by 600,000 (NCES[2]).

- Older, non-traditional students are expected to comprise 45% of the national student body in 1997, a 3% increase from 1987 (NCES[2]).

- Between 1985 and 2000, an additional 40,000 students over 25 years of age will enroll annually in colleges and universities in the U.S.; 80% will be part-time students (Keane, 1985[11]).

- Only about 46 out of 100 students in America graduate on time from the institution they entered. These students are generally stop-outs, not drop-outs. In 7 years, 70 out of 100 will have graduated from some institution (Hodgkinson[10]).

- In South Carolina in the 1990s, assuming no change in the rates of college participation (the number of persons aged 15-34 enrolled in college), the number of high school graduates and the number of high school graduates entering college will decline by approximately 11% (SCDE[12], SREB[3]).

- South Carolina's collegiate participation rate lags behind the southern region and the United States as a whole. The U.S. participation rate in 1986 was 156/1000. In the South, it was 130/1000; in South Carolina it was 110/1000 (SREB[3], *SC Statistial Abstract 1989*[23]).

RESTRUCTURING OF THE ECONOMY WILL CONTINUE

- The service sector will account for a larger share of the U.S. work force. In 1984, it accounted for 72.2% of the labor force; by 1994 the Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates it will account for 74.4%. By the year 2000, it may account for 88% of the work force (World Future Society[9]).

- Between 1979 and 1985, 1.7 million U.S. manufacturing jobs disappeared (World Future Society[9]).

- In 1970, agriculture and mining employed 4.6% of the national labor force; by 1995 that number will dip to 3% (World Future Society[9]).

- By the year 2001, the United States will likely be the number three economic power behind Western Europe and Southeast Asia (Harris, 1988-89[13]).

- Currently, 39% of parts used in U.S. manufacturing are imported (World Future Society[9]).

- Between 1986 and 2000, employment in South Carolina will grow faster (24.2%) than the nation as a whole (22.3%), but slower than the Southern region (SREB[3]).

- From 1985 to 2000, the South Carolina work force will grow by 29% while nationally the work force will grow by 22%. (Palmetto Perspective[14]; WF2000[15])

- In 1986, the national average for export related jobs was 19 per 1,000 population; in South Carolina there were 20 export related jobs per 1,000 population (*States in Profile, 1990*[16]).

- In 1988, U.S. affiliates of foreign companies accounted for 15 jobs per 1,000 population; in South Carolina U.S. affiliates accounted for 23.5 jobs per 1,000 population (*States in Profile, 1990*[16]).

JOBS WILL REQUIRE MORE EDUCATION

- In 1990, 50% of all new jobs in America will require training beyond high school; 75% by the year 2000. According to the American Society for Training and Development, by the year 2000, 75% of all workers presently employed will need retraining (Roe[17]).

- When jobs in the U.S. were given numerical ratings according to the math, language, and reasoning skills required, 40% of current jobs and 27% of new jobs require the lowest skill categories. However 41% of new jobs are in the three highest skill areas compared to 24% of current jobs (Roe[17]).

- The proportion of jobs in the U.S. requiring baccalaureate degrees will increase from 22% to 33% (WF2000[15]).

- 90% of all scientific and technical knowledge has been generated in the last 30 years (Parnell[1]).

- About half of all service workers in the U.S. (44% of the labor force by 2000) will be involved in collecting, analyzing, synthesizing, structuring, storing, or retrieving information as a basis of knowledge (Cetron, 1988[18]).

- Output per worker during the 1990s is projected to double, from .7% per year to 1.5%, the same rate as in the 1960s. A combination of older, more stable, and better-educated workers, and higher rates of investment will support this improvement (WF2000[15]).

- By the year 2000, the average job in the Southeast will require almost 14 years of formal education (USDL[19]).

THE LABOR FORCE WILL NO LONGER BE PRIMARILY COMPOSED OF WHITE, NATIVE-BORN MALES

- Approximately 63% of new entrants into the U.S. labor force between 1985 and 2000 will be women (World Future Society[9]).
- The national labor force will expand by only 1% annually (WF2000[15]).
- The number of U.S. workers 18-24 years old will decrease by 8% and the work force will get older. The average age of workers will increase from 36 to 39 (WF2000[15]).
- White males will comprise only 15% of new workers in America (WF2000[15]).
- Non-whites, women and immigrants will make up more than five-sixths of the net additions to the national workforce between now and the year 2000:

	1985 Labor Force	Net New Workers 1985-2000
Total	115,461,000	25,000,000
Native Born White Men	47%	15%
Native Born White Women	36%	42%
Native Born Non-white Men	5%	7%
Native Born Non-white Women	5%	13%
Immigrant Men	4%	13%
Immigrant Women	3%	9%

Source: WF2000[15]

WE WILL CONTINUE TO FACE SERIOUS SOCIAL PROBLEMS

- Children make up 40% of America's poor (Martin, 1988[20]).
- 25% of all American young people still do not graduate from high school; only 59% of black and 50% of Hispanic young people graduate from high school. Half of American young people do not continue on to college (*Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1985*[21]).
- 70% of the nation's 17-year-olds cannot draw inferences from written materials; of these 17 year olds, 66% cannot solve math problems with several steps (Roe[17]).

- In the nation, 29% more blacks graduated from high school in 1982 than in 1975, but black enrollment in college dropped 11% during that period (Hodgkinson[22]).

- In the mid-1980s 14% of the nation's population was in poverty; 17.6% of South Carolina's population was poor (*States in Profile, 1990*[16]).

- In 1987 6.1% of American mothers received late or no prenatal care; in South Carolina 9% of mothers did not receive adequate prenatal care (*States in Profile, 1990*[16]).

- 22% of all U.S. births in 1985 were to unmarried women; in South Carolina 26.4% of births were to unmarried women (*SC Statistical Abstract, 1989*[23]).

- In 1986 there were 226.8 federal and state prisoners per 100,000 population nationally; 345.8 per 100,000 population in South Carolina (*SC Statistical Abstract, 1989*[23]).

- Over 80% of South Carolina's prisoners are high school dropouts (Hodgkinson[22]).

- In 1988, the South Carolina Department of Youth Services reported 17,158 referrals to intake, a 53.95% increase from 1984 (SCDYS[24]).

DESPITE SOME ECONOMIC GAINS, SOUTH CAROLINA WILL CONTINUE TO FACE FINANCIAL CONSTRAINTS

- South Carolina can look forward to moderate increases in real personal income (adjusted for inflation), retail sales, and multiple family housing starts through 1994 in spite of the current recession and budgetary problems. Single family housing starts should increase overall through 1993 (USC College of Business Administration[25]).

- Because South Carolina's level of personal income is still low relative to the nation, the state's per capita revenue was only 78.4% of the U.S. average in 1988 (compared to 74.3% in 1978), despite having grown 131.5% between 1978 and 1988 (compared to 119.5% growth nationally) (S.C. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations[26]).

- In 1988 South Carolina ranked only 44th among the states in a U.S. Advisory Council on Intergovernmental Relations classification of "tax capacity", a measure of a state's underlying tax base, even though it had increased from 76% of the national average in 1979 to 79% of the national average in 1988 (S.C. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations[26]).

- South Carolina's financial system taps most of its tax capacity. Its "tax effort" or the projected capacity divided by actual tax collections, is about equal to the national average. However, tax effort varies considerably across specific tax sources, with individual income being taxed heavily relative to the nation, and

corporate income being taxed lightly relative to the nation, but both are in line with the region (S.C. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations[26]).

- South Carolina ranks sixth in the nation in the proportion of tax revenue designated for specific purposes or "earmarked" (S.C. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations[26]).

- South Carolina relies heavily on intergovernmental revenue, receiving $655 more per capita than its citizens pay in federal taxes; yet in the past five years the federal share of state and local government revenues has declined, and continuing problems with the federal deficit may make the federal government an unreliable benefactor (S.C. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations[26]).

- Without significant increases in the state's personal income level and in its economic base, the state will continue to face financial constraints (S.C. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations[26]).

Some Observations on Challenges and Opportunities

The demographic, economic, and social trends documented above will produce both challenges and opportunities for post-secondary education in South Carolina. Task Forces established by the Council of Presidents will identify appropriate institutional strategies in three specific areas: enrollment, quality, and inter-institutional collaboration. This section of the environmental scan seeks to offer some preliminary observations that may be of use to the Task Forces as they begin their work. It must be emphasized that these observations are intended only as a point of departure in the effort identify strategies for managing changes in the external environment. Thus the observations that follow are not intended to be either definitive or exhaustive.[1]

ENROLLMENT: It seems clear that enrollment constraints from the decreasing size of birth cohorts must not be ignored. A "business-as-usual" institutional response will almost certainly lead to lower enrollments the next several years and to economic problems for the state. With aggressive program planning and implementation aimed at increasing rates of application, enrollment and retention, higher education may be able to address simultaneously the need to forestall enrollment declines, along with broader social objectives aimed at equipping a larger number of minorities and poor people with the skills that are going to be necessary in the near future. Levine notes, for example, that

> (1) increasing the high school graduation rate of blacks and Hispanics to the white average completion rate by 1998 would increase the college pool by more than 150,000; (2) raising the college participation rate of blacks and Hispanics to that

---

[1] This section draws on heavily on findings reported in Bruce A. Montgomery and Martha L. Hesse, "Environmental Scanning and External Tendencies Affecting American Higher Education", *Planning for Higher Education*, 18:4 (1989-90), pp 61-101.

> of whites would produce another 160,000 potential students; and (3) increasing the college participation rates of poor whites (bottom two socioeconomic quartiles) to the average for all whites would increase the size of the pool by almost another 300,000. In short, higher education can more than make up for the demographic decline by better serving the underserved (Levine[39]).

Such an effort probably implies a higher level of collaboration between educational institutions. These might include higher education programs to improve K-12 education for minority students; after school programs offering special assistance and enhancement; and joint programs to increase minority access to post-secondary education. Such an effort would also seem to imply an increased level of financial aid directed toward targeted populations.

Minorities and the disadvantaged are not, however, the only targets of opportunity for higher education.

- By the year 2000, workers are likely to average three career changes and seven job changes during their lives (American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1988). Universities will need to include more students who are returning to the classroom after periods of work (Lynton and Elman, 1987[27]).
- Up to 4% of the labor force will be in job retraining programs in the 1990s to upgrade skills and knowledge to keep pace with changing technology and changing demands of the workplace (Cetron, 1988[18]).
- Seventy-five percent of all workers currently employed will need retraining by the year 2000 (Wishard, 1988[28]).
- Between 1985 and 2000, an additional 40,000 students over 25 years of age will enroll annually in colleges and universities; 80% will be part-time students (Keane, 1985[11]).
- Longevity, retirement, and pure intellectual interest are bringing older adults, in the form of the lifelong learner, in large numbers to campus (Harcleroad and Ostar, 1987[29]).

Yet other strategies available to higher education include

- Efforts to increase enrollment of transfer students;
- Efforts to increase graduate enrollments; and
- Efforts to increase out-of-state enrollments.

QUALITY: Quality improvement is an essential component of meeting the demands that will be placed on post-secondary education in the next century. Our students are likely to work and compete in an international economic and social context unlike any that we have previously experienced. Harris, for example, notes:

> By the year 2001, the United States will likely be the number three economic power behind Western Europe and Southeast Asia. To qualify for work in this new global economy, the young person of 2001 will have to have a global perspective, and intimate knowledge of what the world outside the U.S. is really like (Harris[13]).

This picture is complicated by the increasing importance of technology in manufacturing, in service industries and, indeed, throughout society. In this context, both science literacy and scientific education are major educational quality issues at a global level. Bloch[41] notes that the number of American college graduates interested in pursuing science and mathematics degrees declined steadily throughout the 1980s. The problem extends into precollege preparation. In a 1988 national assessment of educational progress, only 7 percent of 17-year-olds were prepared for college-level science courses. In South Carolina, future technical and scientific education will be important in supporting and maintaining the manufacturing work force which is projected to remain at 22 percent of the state's total workforce in 2000 (*Palmetto Perspective*[14]). In contrast, by the same date, national employment in manufacturing will have declined to 15 percent of the total work force.

Maintaining and improving the quality of post-secondary education is not simply a matter of assessment and evaluation. The quality of faculty, the quality of educational facilities, and the quality of the applicant pool, as well as the quality of program delivery all interact to produce outcomes. At a minimum, maintaining and improving the quality of faculty implies effective recruitment, retention, and human resource development programs. In that context, several points should be noted:

- Excellent faculty members will be in greater demand in and out of higher education, with black faculty particularly in short supply.

- Many colleges and universities are unable to fill full-time faculty positions with qualified persons. In 1989, four in ten institutions were experiencing faculty shortages in computer science, one in three in business, one in four in mathematics, and one in four in the health professions. These shortages are expected to worsen and to widen and include a range of academic disciplines over the next ten years (El-Khwas, 1989[30])

- Higher education is losing its ability to compete effectively with more lucrative professions in attracting the ablest young people (Schuster, 1986). Today, over 40 percent of doctoral recipients are working in business, industry, and government (Lozier and Dooris, 1988-89[31])

- Average faculty salaries have declined by about 9 percent (when adjusted for inflation) since 1972, and the adjusted purchasing power of the average faculty member today is $1,700 less than it was in the early 1970s.

- By the early 21st century, institutions of higher education will be facing annual shortages of 7,500 Ph.D.s in natural science and engineering Only seven candidates will be available for every ten Ph.D. positions in the humanities and social sciences between 1997 and 2002 (American Association of Universities, 1990[32]).

- Knowledge is growing exponentially, where even specialists find it hard to keep up in their own fields (e.g., more books have been published since the 1940s than in all previous generations) (Bok, 1986[33])

- The rate at which we can infuse new technology into our society will be determined largely by the rate that university faculty can renew their own bases of knowledge (Botkin, et al., 1984[34])

- 5000 to 7000 scientific articles are written each day, and information is doubling every 5.5 years -- the problems for the future is not the supply of information but its selection (Cross, 1985[35])

- The half life of an engineer's knowledge today is five years (Cetron, 1988[18])

- 85 percent of the information on the National Institutes of Health Computers is upgraded in five years (Cetron, 1988[18])

The quality of physical facilities is also clearly an important component of maintaining and improving the quality of post-secondary education. Increased support will be required for higher education to sustain the present level of effort at the present quality.

- Over the last decade, the cost of operating the average college and university has increased 23 percent faster than the rate of inflation (Wagner, 1988[36])

- Based on the Higher Education Price Index, colleges in 1988 paid 28 percent more for goods than they did in 1983 (Research Associates of Washington, 1988[37])

- Across the nation, capital renewal and deferred maintenance costs for university facilities have reached the critical stage. The National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (1986) estimates that accumulated requirements for rehabilitation, remodeling, and new construction for all of higher education may easily be $50 billion in 1985 dollars. (NASULGC[38])

The quality and preparation of the college bound applicant pool also affects the overall quality of higher educational outcomes. There is clearly much that needs to be done to address the quality of preparation of incoming students. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching[21] reports, for example, that in 1984, 16 percent of college freshmen were enrolled in remedial courses in reading, 21 percent in writing, and 25 percent in mathematics. Abraham[42] reports that based on a survey of 404 public colleges and universities in the fifteen southern states, nearly 36 percent of first-time freshmen (over 200,000 students) needed remedial instruction in 1986.

COLLABORATION: Institutions of higher learning constitute an enormous reservoir of knowledge and talent. When our nation struggled with the problems of agricultural production in the latter half of the 19th Century, the Morrill Act created the framework for a profound collaboration between higher education and the agricultural community. Drawing on the talents of higher education and the strength of American agriculture, that collaboration has resulted in the most productive agricultural sector in the world.

As we move toward the new century, the issues faced by our state and our nation are even more profound than those that produced the land grant colleges. The themes are iterated throughout this report: aging of the population; a restructured economy requiring more educated

and flexible workers; economic competition on a global scale; and population dynamics that will inexorably produce more diverse nation. These trends admit the possibility of interactive effects which could have troubling consequences for all of our institutions, including higher education. A mismatch between jobs and worker capabilities, for instance, will undoubtedly encourage mobile capital to seek other investment alternatives. To the extent that those alternatives are offshore, the U.S. economy will be weakened along with the local, state, and federal tax base that undergirds our commitment to public education and other means of meeting individual needs. Weakening of that system would almost undoubtedly lead to even further declines.

In this context, it is not sufficient for higher education to simply mend its own fences. As the land grant colleges and universities did a century ago, we must renew our commitment to look outward beyond the walls of the academy and ask how our institutional leadership and our talents can contribute to addressing the issues posed by an ever more complex world. Collaboration must become a way of thinking about higher education's role.

Opportunities abound for strengthening existing collaborative arrangements and developing new ones. Meeting the challenges to higher education enrollments and program quality, for example, is not a task that higher education alone can accomplish. The educational process through post-secondary school spans a minimum of a decade and a half and may continue for a lifetime. As Hodgkinson[10] points out, the realization that institutions of higher education can be no better than the secondary schools that feed them leads to the conclusion that more post-secondary institutions must begin developing collaborative relationships with primary and secondary schools. A wide range of potentially useful possibilities exist, including, but not limited to the following:

- Personnel exchange or loan programs;
- Joint study groups to identify specific problems and solutions;

- Jointly seeking external support for pilot programs; and
- Expanded workshops and seminars for teacher development.

Other opportunities for collaboration derive from the fact that the private sector and government will face enormous challenges in the coming years. Global competition, loss of technological leadership, inadequate investment in research and development, and the transformation of the U.S. labor force will place enormous strains on our business leadership. Government at all levels may falter under the staggering weight of the federal deficit, trade imbalances, runaway medical costs, crumbling infrastructure, and unaddressed social needs. Institutions of higher learning have the potential to contribute more than a supply of human resources to government and industry as they face an uncertain future. By reaching beyond the boundaries of the educational system to collaborate and by focusing a significant portion of higher education's talent and knowledge base on social and economic problems, higher education may, once again, be able to help our state and our nation face the challenges of the coming century.

Sources

[1]Parnell, Dale. *Dateline 2000: The New Higher Education Agenda.* Washington, D.C.: The Community College Press, 1990.

[2]National Center for Education Statistics. U.S. Department of Education.

[3]Southern Regional Education Board. *Trends: Education, Employment, Population, Challenge 2000.*

[4]Cetron, Marvin, and Davis, Owen. *American Renaissance: Our Life At The Turn of the 21st Century.* New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989.

[5]South Carolina Division of Research and Statistical Services. *South Carolina Statistical Abstract 1987-88.*

[6]College of Humanities and Social Sciences Computing Laboratory. University of South Carolina-Columbia.

[7]South Carolina Commission on Aging. "A Profile of Older South Carolinians."

[8]United States Bureau of Census.

[9]1990 World Future Society. "Into the 21st Century: Long-Term Trends Affecting the United States." A special report prepared by Marvin J. Cetron, Wanda Pocho, and Rebecca Luckin of Forecasting International, Ltd.

[10]Hodgkinson, Harold L. "All One System: Demographics of Education, Kindergarten through Graduate School." The Institute for Educational Leadership, Inc.

[11]Keane, J.G. "Higher Education: Some Trends Stressing the Need for Strategic Focus." *Continuum,* 1985, 49(2), pp 88-100.

[12]South Carolina Department of Education, Office of Research Report Series. "Births, Selected Grade Comparisons, High School Graduates, and Number Entering College for the State and Counties, 1960 through 1995." October 1989.

[13]Harris, L. "The American Work Force - Restoring Its Competitiveness." *Phi Kappa Phi Journal,* 1988 70 (1), pp 38-39.

[14]South Carolina Employment Security Commission, "Palmetto Perspective: South Carolina's People and Jobs in the Year 2000." November 1987.

[15]Hudson Institute. "Workforce 2000: Work and Workers for the Twenty-First Century." June, 1987.

[16]State Policy Research, Inc. *States In Profile: The State Policy Reference Book 1990.* Second edition.

[17]Roe, Mary Ann. *Education and U.S. Competitiveness: The Community College Role.* IC Institute, The University of Texas at Austin, 1989.

[18]Cetron, M. "Long-term Trends Affecting Undergraduate Education into the Twenty-First Century." Paper presented at the National Education Conference, 28 September 1988, Kansas City, Missouri, Arlington, VA: Forecasting International Ltd., 1988.

[19]United States Department of Labor. *The Southeast's 21st Challenge.* Atlanta, GA: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, 1990.

[20]Martin, D. "Wake Up: The American Dream is Fading, and our Future is at Risk." *The American School Board Journal,* 1988, 175(2), pp. 21-24.

[21]Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. "Planning for the Future." *Change,* 1985, 17(3), pp. 31-35.

[22]Hodgkinson, Harold L. "South Carolina: The State and Its Educational System." Institute for Educational Leadership, Inc. and the Center for Demographic Policy. October, 1990.

[23]South Carolina Division of Research and Statistical Services. *South Carolina Statistical Abstract 1989.*

[24]South Carolina's Department of Youth Services, *Annual Statistical Report.*

[25]University of South Carolina College of Business Administration, "The S.C. Outlook," in *Strategic Planning and Budgeting: A System Wide Approach,* Office of Institutional Planning, USC-Columbia, July 1990.

[26]The South Carolina Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, *Financing Government in the Palmetto State,* February 1991.

[27]Lynton, E.A. and Elman, S.E. *New Priorities for the University.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1987.

[28]Wishard, W.V.D. *A Perspective for the '90s: A World in Search of Meaning.* Reston, VA: n.p., August 1988.

[29]Harcleroad, F.F. and Ostar, A.W. *Colleges and Universities for Change: America's Comprehensive Public State Colleges and Universities.* Washington, D.C.: AASCU Press, 1987.

[30]El-Khawas, E. *Campus Trends, 1989.* Higher Education Panel Reports, No. 78. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1989.

[31]Lozier, G.G. and Dooris, M.J. "Elimination of Mandatory Retirement: Anticipating Faculty Response." *Planning for Higher Education, 1988-89*, 17(2), pp. 1-13.

[32]Association of American Universities. *The Ph.D. Shortage: The Federal Role*. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Universities (January 11, 1990).

[33]Bok, D. *Higher Learning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986.

[34]Botkin, J.: Dimancescu, D.; and Stata, R. *The Innovators*. New York: Harper & Row, 1984.

[35]Cross, K.P. "The Changing Role of Higher Education in the Learning Society." *Continuum*, 1985, 49(2), pp. 101-110.

[36]Wagener, U., senior ed. "Seeing Straight through a Muddle." *Policy Perspectives*, 1988 1(1), pp. 1-7.

[37]Research Associates of Washington. *Higher Education Prices and Price Indexes: 1988 Update*. Washington, D.C.: Research Associates of Washington, 1988.

[38]National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. "Report on the Future of Comprehensive State Research Universities and Land-Grant Colleges: Findings and Conclusions of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges Special Committee on the Future of the State Universities." The National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, 1986.

[39]Levine, Arthur. "Conclusions and Recommendations: Creating a Brighter Educational Future," 1989.

[40]American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. *Building Communities: A Vision For a New Century*. A Report of the Commission on the Future of Community Colleges. American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, April, 1988.

[41]Bloch, E. "Managing for Challenging Times; A National Research Strategy." *Issues in Science and Technology*, 1986, 2(2), pp. 20-29.

[42]Abraham, Jr. A.A. "Remedial Education in College: How Widespread Is It?" Southern Regional Education Board, *Issues in Higher Education*. No. 24, 1988.

Task Force Reports

During the first planning cycle, three task forces comprised of institutional representatives and Commission on Higher Education staff studied school/college collaboration, enrollment, and quality incentives. Appended here as background material, the final task force reports provided many of the ideas and recommendations that appear in the statewide plan. Please note that recommendations contained in these reports are not intended to be part of the statewide plan unless they are included among the objectives or strategies found in the plan itself.

WORK UNDONE, WORK TO DO:

Access, Enrollment and Achievement in South Carolina Higher Education

Task Force on Enrollment
April, 1991

For nearly twenty years, the State of South Carolina has undertaken to improve access to higher education. Much has been accomplished by the creation of new public institutions, the provision of financial assistance to students to attend private colleges and universities, by the establishment of minimum admission standards for four-year colleges and universities, and by the alteration and expansion of the missions of existing institutions. A measure of the success of these efforts are the 16.3 percent and 29.8 percent increases, respectively, in undergraduate and graduate headcount enrollments that occurred between 1980 and 1990, a period when enrollment declines were anticipated.

In addition to enrollment growth, these efforts have helped to forge the framework of a comprehensive system of public higher education in South Carolina such that virtually every citizen is within reasonable commuting distance of a public college or university. To a remarkable extent, then, the primary goal set in 1979 for postsecondary education - "to provide the opportunity for learning beyond the secondary level for all who need or seek it"(emphasis added) - has been realized in terms of geographic access and the availability of academic programs.

WORK UNDONE

But geographic access is not yet matched by enrollment or educational achievement: there is work undone. An appreciation of what remains to be done can be gained by comparing South Carolina with neighboring southeastern states and the Nation. In some respects, the Palmetto State has much in common with other southern states and, in those ways, differs from the nation as a whole. Like its southern counterparts, South Carolina witnessed rapid population growth in the 1970s and the 1980s and will continue to experience growth in the 1990s.

The southeastern United States is home to many Black Americans and nearly one-third of all South Carolinians are black. The future of America and this state in particular rests in large measure with the success of these citizens.

These parallels between South Carolina and its southeastern neighbors do not extend to higher education enrollment or to academic achievement. The State did not match the Nation's increase in enrollments in post-secondary education from the late 1970s to the late 1980s and lagged the southeastern average by nearly 10 percent for the same period. High school graduation and college-going rates for South Carolina are lower than those of either the United States or the entire Southeast. Equally troubling is the failure to increase minority enrollment in numbers even approaching what is essential and right.

Nor did South Carolina achieve as much in recent years as did others. With the notable exception of graduate-level degrees, we did not keep pace with the Nation or the rest of the South in **awarding degrees**.

Despite significant progress, then, South Carolina, in comparison to other states and the Nation as a whole, remains "**undereducated**" in nearly every population category. Again, there is much work undone from the past two decade's initiatives.

WORK TO DO

Not only is there work undone from the 1970's and the 1980's, there is much new work to do in the 1990's. The economy in which we will compete is **international** in scope and the marketplace is **global** in character. The **knowledge** and skills of the workforce are among the most influential factors in economic growth; indeed, the **quality of education** and the extent of a community's or a state's **educational achievement** have assumed paramount importance in key business and industry decisions.

Nor will it suffice for South Carolinians to aspire to or even to match the levels of higher education participation and achievement of neighboring Southeastern states since the region as a whole continues to lag behind the rest of the nation. Moreover, the Nation's record of educating its citizenry and preparing the workforce needed to compete successfully in today's world is not an adequate goal for South Carolina. A much bolder strategy is required.

Similarly, the very success of the past two decades' efforts points up the need for a comprehensive effort to increase enrollment in higher education and to improve educational achievement without compromising quality. With one notable exception, much of the overall change in higher education enrollments - increases and decreases - has been due less to individual institutions' practices than to factors beyond the control of higher education. Enrollment has varied as a result of demographic and economic changes, improvements in elementary and secondary education, and public policies aimed purposefully at expanding access to and enrollment in South Carolina's colleges and universities. To date, the institutions by themselves have had a rather limited and incremental capacity to influence new enrollments of persons in those groups still under-represented in higher education. And this rather sobering assertion stands even in the light of sustained and substantial efforts (e.g., programs to increase minority participation).

One exception to this pattern has been the ability of institutions to alter their practices and policies so as to better accommodate the educational needs and aspirations of part-time students. Throughout the nation in the 1980s, colleges and universities were able to address, meet, and, to some extent, satisfy the needs and aspirations of students who more often than not combined employment and study by pursuing post-secondary education at undergraduate and graduate levels on a less-than-full-time basis. While this was not completely the case in South Carolina (where part-time graduate enrollments rose significantly), the record of other states in increasing part-time

student enrollment encourages a closer look at their institutional practices and those of South Carolina's colleges and universities.

The portrait that emerges from a review of the past twenty years is one of a state committed to the principle of educational opportunity for all of its citizens. The people of South Carolina can and should take pride in the fact that opportunity was expanded, that access has been improved. The task before us now is to move beyond geographic access to expanded participation and achievement in higher education. To do that will require measured strategies that are at once attuned to the forces known to influence enrollments in higher education, sensitive to the distinctive practices and missions of the State's colleges and universities, and nevertheless comprehensive in their scope and intent, namely, to improve dramatically and substantively the educational achievement of the people of South Carolina.

GOALS, STRATEGIES AND INITIATIVES

South Carolina and her institutions of higher education must plan for and act to achieve significant gains in educational participation and achievement; anything less will deny the State even the opportunity to improve the lives of her people. Accordingly, the members of this task force initially proposed the following enrollment and achievement goals for South Carolina:

GOALS

1. increase the college-going rate of high school seniors from 50 to 65 percent;

2. increase the number of Black students in higher education from the current 22 percent of enrollment to at least 42 percent by 2000;

3. increase the retention and persistence rates of undergraduate students between the first and second years of enrollment from current institutional averages by 8 percent by 1994;

4. by 2000 increase the current percentage rate of participation in post-secondary education of each population age-group by one-third;

5. increase the percent of associate-degree program graduates who pursue baccalaureate degrees by 200 percent by 2000;

6. increase the number of South Carolinians who hold associate or baccalaureate degrees to 30 percent of the State's population by 2000.

As urgent and real as the need for improving educational achievement in South Carolina is, the current environment makes it difficult to

plan and to implement strategies that are not at least tempered in the near-term by practical considerations of very limited available resources. Inadequate and even declining State support for higher education is the most obvious of these considerations, but there are others. The full effects of statewide admission standards are only now becoming apparent. Colleges and universities are just beginning to implement mandated requirements for assessing institutional effectiveness and the impact of a statewide system of college-transfer programs in the technical colleges remains unclear.

Furthermore, effective planning will involve reconciling the statewide goal of expanded participation and increased achievement in higher education with institutions' distinctive missions, aspirations, and capacities. And the State and the individual institutions must and will be held accountable for their respective roles.

In light of these considerations, the task force determined that the institutions themselves should have the opportunity to assess the appropriateness and feasibility of these six goals. As desirable and as vital as these goals may be, they may nevertheless exceed the capacities of South Carolina and its colleges and universities or be incongruent with the missions and aspirations of all of the institutions of higher education. Accordingly, the task force elected to survey all of the public and private colleges and universities within the State using a very simple instrument (see Appendix A) designed around the six enrollment and achievement goals outlined above.

The schedule for completing the work of the task force did not allow the institutions much time to reflect upon or to respond to the survey. Still, 40[1] of the 64 colleges and universities with which the Commission of Higher Education has relationships responded within the one-week period allowed, albeit, not all chose to provide complete responses. Tables 1-6 depict the aggregate results from this survey. (The written comments provided by some institutions are also noteworthy but were not analyzed in detail or reported here.)

A complete analysis of these results was not attempted: again, the schedule for completing the work of the task force did not allow for such analysis. What follows, then, is an overview of the major points raised by the survey results.

With respect to the institutions' assessments of the original enrollment and achievement goals, the survey results indicate broad general agreement on the appropriateness of those goals. Save for Goal 4 and its call for increased participation in higher education by all population groups, over 90 percent of the responding institutions expressed the view that those goals were appropriate for the State's system of higher education to pursue (Table 1a).

Less consensus was apparent in the institutions' assessment of the feasibility of the six goals (Table 1b). Increases in college-going

---

[1]Two additional private institutions responded after the results of the survey were compiled and their responses are not included here.

rates of high school seniors, retention and persistence, transfers from associate to baccalaureate degree programs, and the percentage of the State's population holding post-secondary degrees were endorsed as "attainable" by at least two-thirds of all responding institutions.

The responding institutions split on the feasibility of increasing black enrollment in higher education to the extent called for by Goal 2 even as the greatest number of responding institutions, 31, indicated (Table 2) that Goal 2 was of particular importance. Not reported here but apparent in the survey results was the fact that this difference of opinion was true for each sector of higher education. At the same time, black students ranked first, third, second, and first, respectively, as the population group from which the public senior, two-year USC, TEC, and private institutions expect to draw any enrollment increases during the 1990's (Table 6).

The institutions also split over Goal 4 and its call for increasing participation in higher education by every population group in South Carolina, with a majority, 53 percent, expressing the view that the goal of a one-third increase over current rates was unattainable. Here too, the difference of opinions was apparent within each sector of the higher education community.

The institutions were asked to project undergraduate headcount enrollment for the years 1994, 1997, and 2000. All but three of the public senior institutions responded, four of the five USC two-year campuses provided projections, slightly more than one-half of the

private senior institutions, 14 of the 16 technical education colleges, and two of the three non-profit junior colleges gave estimates of future enrollments (Table 3). Responding institutions constituted 58, 79, 58, 76, and 67 percent, respectively, of the fall, 1990 undergraduate headcount enrollment of those five sectors of higher education.

Table 4 summarizes those projections by sector. Each sector anticipates enrollment increases ranging from a low of 27 percent in the senior public institutions to highs of 59 and 60 percent in the technical and private junior colleges, respectively. Overall, the responding institutions forecast a 41 percent increase in undergraduate enrollment. By comparison, undergraduate headcount enrollment rose by slightly more than 16 percent between 1980 and 1990.

The relative "shares" of projected enrollment increases are reported in Table 5 and depict some redistribution away from the public and private senior institutions to the two-year colleges. Comments provided by responding institutions include repeated references to the cost of attending senior colleges and universities as the factor promoting increased enrollments at two-year institutions.

Finally, Table 6 depicts the comparative rankings of overlapping sources of projected enrollment increases. While a measure of similarity among types of responding institutions is apparent in the high rankings of black and part-time students, it is noteworthy that

differences do exist in the relative importance of the different sources for any enrollment growth.

In light of these results, the task force suggests that our original proposal goals for enrollment and achievement be modified as follows:

REVISED GOALS

1. **increase the college-going rate of high school seniors from 50 to 65 percent;**

2. **increase the number of Black students in higher education from the current 22 percent of enrollment to at least 30 percent by 2000;**

3. **increase the retention and persistence rates of undergraduate students between the first and second years of enrollment from current institutional averages by 8 percent by 1994;**

4. **increase the percent of associate-degree program graduates who pursue baccalaureate degrees by 200 percent by 2000;**

5. **increase the number of South Carolinians who hold associate or baccalaureate degrees to 30 percent of the State's population by 2000.**

Writing in the SREB publication Educational Benchmarks 1990, Joseph Creech noted that the students enrolled in the ninth grade in the fall of 1990 will be the first new teachers, professors, physicians, and lawyers of the next century.

> What do these facts about our entering high school students tell us? They show us that -
>
> (1) We should take action **now** and support promising initatives of the 1980s if we wish to raise the educational achievement and attainment levels of the population by the turn of the century.
>
> (2) We must measure progress toward goals over time because the results of educational improvement will not be apparent immediately.
>
> (3) Improvements in a state's elementary and secondary schools cannot be separated from improvements in the quality of its colleges and universities.

Current conditions preclude an immediate and expensive statewide effort and therefore make it necessary that we develop a measured but comprehensive strategy that can produce results in the near-, mid-, and far-terms. The progress achieved at each stage serves as a prelude and stimulus to refinement of the State's planning process and enables both the Commission for Higher Education and the institutions to adjust their respective efforts.

Near-Term, 1991-1994

During this period both the Commission and the institutions should give special emphasis in their respective efforts to improving support for and service to the existing and potential part-time student population of the State. The colleges and universities have already demonstrated a capacity to serve these students.

In addition, national, regional, and state trends make it likely that the institutions will be receiving more part-time students during the next few years. By improving the ways in which the colleges and universities serve the educational needs of those students during this period -- especially in terms of what are sure to be lifelong learning needs, the institutions may be able to encourage those students to persist and to attract more new students to enroll.

This strategy has the additional advantage of addressing both baccalaureate-degree students and persons who already hold an undergraduate degree and are interested in post-graduate study. Most of these persons are part-time rather than full-time students. Furthermore, it may well be that enhancements aimed primarily at the special needs of part-time students will have positive effects on the retention of full-time students.

Mid-Term, 1991-1997

One of the most daunting challenges to all of higher education, indeed to society as a whole, is to make good on the promise of equality for black Americans. Good faith and strenuous efforts notwithstanding, African Americans do not participate as fully and therefore do not achieve as much educationally as their white counterparts, regardless of age, gender, or any other characteristic. Even were it possible to set aside the moral imperatives for improvement, there is the simple but profound fact that South Carolina cannot afford to allow so significant a number of its citizens to go without the fullest measure of educational opportunity and participation.

The Commission on Higher Education and the institutions have worked to improve minority access to and achievement in higher education, but the cost to students of attending college is now a formidable barrier. The total average per-student expenditure by South Carolina's colleges and institutions is quite similar to that of neighboring states. The major difference is that we here ask students and their families to pay a much larger portion of those costs than does North Carolina or Georgia. And because race and income are so closely correlated, with black incomes falling well below those of whites, the students' portion of the cost of attending college serves as a substantial barrier for many black South Carolinians who would otherwise seek to enroll in, persist at, and graduate from college.

During the next six years, extraordinary efforts must be made to enable more blacks to participate successfully in higher education. The collaboration called for between K-12 schools and higher education must and will contain a focused program to intervene early enough to improve the likelihood that black families will prepare and aspire for participation in higher education.

A second effective strategy is to reduce the cost barrier. As a start and for the first four years of the implementation of this strategy, tuition grants aimed at low-income students should be made available. Thereafter, the strategy should shift to using State appropriations to reduce the student-family portion of the cost of tuition. By these means, <u>all</u> South Carolinians, but especially those now most likely to

be prevented from enrolling in higher education, would have a better opportunity to participate in college.

Far-Term, 1991-2000

After cost, the greatest deterrent to increased enrollments and improved achievement in South Carolina is the low number of students who emerge from secondary education. The State's colleges and universities are already engaged in a variety of collaborations with elementary and secondary schools and these hold forth great promise for redressing not only the problem of drop-outs from high school but also for raising the educational aspirations of children and their parents.

Similarly, there is a rich harvest to be gleaned from current and expanded cooperative ventures and relationships between and among two-year, four-year, and graduate institutions. Too few students go beyond the associate and baccalaureate degrees.

What is needed is a more comprehensive method for all of South Carolina's educational systems - elementary and secondary, public and private, undergraduate and graduate - to work together. Ernest Boyer noted some years ago in his work High School that there really is no transition provided for students moving from secondary to postsecondary education. The same can be said for the move from two- to four-year colleges. And despite considerable State support, there is remarkably little communication between public and private colleges and universities.

As a start, the State has much to gain by convening teachers from all sectors of education and engaging them in serious and sustained discussion about what they now teach to students and what they hope results therefrom. Current national debates over the curricula in various disciplines and fields warrant hearings from school, college, and university faculty members in close consultation with one another. Further, educational technology remains an unexploited resource that could be mined most productively by the collaboration of teachers from all types of institutions.

This strategy is one of stages. However laudable the ultimate goal is of increasing enrollment and improving achievement in higher education by everyone, the attainment of that goal requires some choices to be made both at the outset and in process. What is proposed here are a series of choices that will enable the State and its colleges and universities to see to the implementation of that strategy.

Table 1

INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENTS OF ENROLLMENT/ACHIEVEMENT GOALS

	1a. "Appropriateness"		1b. "Attainable"	
GOAL	APPROPRIATE	INAPPROPRIATE	ATTAINABLE	UNATTAINABLE
1) college-going rates	97%	3%	81%	19%
2) black enrollment	92%	8%	46%	54%
3) retention, persistence	90%	10%	89%	11%
4) participation of population	76%	24%	47%	53%
5) associate to baccalaureate	94%	6%	66%	34%
6) hold degrees	100%	0%	76%	24%

Table 2

GOALS OF PARTICULAR IMPORTANCE TO INSTITUTIONS

GOAL	NUMBER OF RESPONSES
1) college-going rates	27
2) black enrollment	31
3) retention, persistence	23
4) participation of population groups	16
5) associate to baccalaureate	17
6) hold degrees	16

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3

UNDERGRADUATE HEADCOUNT ENROLLMENT BY INSTITUTION

Actual and Projected

Institution	Fall 1990	Projected 1994	1997	2000
Clemson	13,010	11,500	11,500	11,500
C. of Charleston	6,663	NR	NR	NR
Francis Marion	3,687	4,000	4,500	5,000
Lander	2,309	2,600	2,900	3,200
MUSC	1,003	NR	NR	NR
SC State	4,615	5,800	6,700	7,700
Citadel	2,335	2,500	2,750	3,000
USC-Aiken	2,966	3,431	3,972	4,698
USC-Coastal	4,080	4,773	5,584	6,532
USC-Columbia	16,017	NR	NR	NR
USC-Spartanburg	3,501	NR	NR	NR
Winthrop	4,173	4,250	4,920	5,695
	64,359	38,854	42,826	47,325
Adjusted*	37,175 (57.8%)			
USC-Beaufort	896	NR	NR	NR
USC-Lancaster	984	1,100	1,200	1,350
USC-Salkehatchie	831	1,100	1,400	1,700
USC-Sumter	1,260	1,410	1,450	1,520
USC-Union	368	426	528	591
	4,339	4,036	4,578	5,161
Adjusted*	3,443 (79.4%)			

NR = Not reported.

* Adjusted to exclude institutions not responding and/or providing projections.

Table 3 (cont.)

UNDERGRADUATE HEADCOUNT ENROLLMENT

Private Institutions

Institution	Fall 1990	Projected 1994	Projected 1997	Projected 2000
Allen	NA	NR	NR	NR
Charleston Southern	2,036	2,406	2,650	2,800
Benedict	1,478	1,600	1,600	1,600
Bob Jones	3,877	NR	NR	NR
Central Wesleyan	934	1,225	1,650	1,800
Claflin	913	NR	NR	NR
Coker	775	843	879	879
Columbia Bible	519	580	600	650
Columbia	1,147	NR	NR	NR
Converse	874	1,200	1,400	1,500
Erskine	493	NR	NR	NR
Furman	2,870	2,500	2,500	2,500
Limestone	1,067	1,000	1,100	1,200
Lutheran	NA	NR	NR	NR
Morris	760	NR	NR	NR
Newberry	709	NR	NR	NR
Presbyterian	1,133	1,150	1,175	1,200
Sherman	NA	412	575	750
Southern Methodist	NA	NR	NR	NR
Vorhees	566	700	775	850
Wofford	1,066	NR	NR	NR
	21,217			
Adjusted*	12,252 (57.7%)	13,616	14,904	15,729

NA = Not available.

NR = Not reporting.

* Adjusted to exclude institutions not responding and/or providing projections.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3 (cont.)

UNDERGRADUATE HEADCOUNT ENROLLMENT
TEC'S

Institution	Fall 1990	Projected 1994	1997	2000
Aiken	1,903	2,226	2,504	2,735
Lowcountry	1,210	1,610	2,140	2,850
Chesterfield-Marlboro	852	1,005	1,200	1,400
Denmark	617	650	700	750
Florence-Darlington	2,324	2,500	2,650	2,750
Greenville	7,917	NR	NR	NR
Horry-Georgetown	1,984	2,109	2,371	2,665
Midlands	7,546	10,000	12,600	15,400
Orangeburg-Calhoun	1,506	1,600	1,700	1,800
Piedmont	2,144	2,500	2,700	3,000
Spartanburg	2,276	2,790	2,828	3,009
Sumter Area	1,929	2,450	2,700	2,900
Tri-County	2,935	4,657	5,120	5,583
Trident	6,939	8,000	8,800	9,600
Williamsburg	503	525	580	630
York	2,924	NR	NR	NR
	45,509			
Adjusted*	34,668 (76.2%)	42,622	48,593	55,072

NA = Not available.

NR = Not reporting.

* Adjusted to exclude institutions not responding and/or providing projections.

Table 3 (cont.)

UNDERGRADUATE HEADCOUNT ENROLLMENT

Private Junior Colleges

Institution	Fall 1990	Projected 1994	1997	2000
Anderson	968	1,100	1,300	1,600
Clinton	88	NR	NR	NR
Columbia Junior	418	NR	NR	NR
Nielson Electronics	169	NR	NR	NR
North Greenville	392	475	525	575
Rutledge-Spartanburg	NA	NR	NR	NR
Rutledge-Greenville	NA	NR	NR	NR
Rutledge-Charleston	NA	NR	NR	NR
Rutledge-Columbia	NA	NR	NR	NR
Spartanburg Methodist	932	NR	NR	NR
	2,967			
Adjusted *	1,360 (45.8%)	1,575	1,825	2,175

NA = Not available.

NR = Not reporting.

* Adjusted to exclude institutions not responding and/or providing projections.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 4

UNDERGRADUATE HEADCOUNT ENROLLMENT

Institution	Fall 1990	Projected 1994	Projected 1997	Projected 2000
Senior Public	64,359			
Adjusted *	37,175	38,854	42,826	47,325
Pct. Change	-	+ 4.5	+ 10.2	+ 10.5
Pct. Change, 1990	-	+ 4.5	+ 15.2	+ 27.3
USC Two-Year	4,339			
Adjusted *	3,443	4,036	4,578	5,161
Pct. Change	-	+ 17.2	+ 13.4	+ 12.7
Pct. Change, 1990	-	+ 17.2	+ 33.0	+ 49.9
Technical Colleges	45,509			
Adjusted *	34,668	42,622	48,593	55,072
Pct. Change	-	+ 22.9	+ 14.0	+ 13.3
Pct. Change, 1990	-	+ 22.9	+ 40.2	+ 58.9
Private Senior	21,217			
Adjusted *	12,252	13,616	14,904	15,729
Pct. Change	-	+ 11.1	+ 9.5	+ 5.5
Pct. Change, 1990	-	+ 11.1	+ 21.7	+ 28.4
Private Junior	2,967			
Adjusted *	1,360	1,575	1,825	2,175
Pct. Change	-	+ 15.8	+ 15.9	+ 19.2
Pct. Change, 1990	-	+ 15.8	+ 34.2	+ 59.9
Total	138,391			
Adjusted *	88,898	100,703	112,726	125,462
Pct. Change	-	+ 13.3	+ 11.9	+ 11.3
Pct. Change, 1990	-	+ 13.3	+ 26.8	+ 41.1

* Adjusted to exclude institutions not responding and/or providing projections.

Table 5

UNDERGRADUATE HEADCOUNT ENROLLMENT PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION
Actual and Projected

Institutional Type	Actual Fall 1990	Adjusted Fall 1990	Projected/Adjusted * 1994	1997	2000	1990-2000
Public Senior	46.5	41.8	38.6	38.0	37.7	- 4.1
USC Two-Year	3.1	3.9	4.0	4.1	4.1	+ 0.2
Technical Colleges	32.9	39.0	42.3	43.1	43.9	+ 4.9
Private Senior	15.3	13.8	13.5	13.2	12.5	- 1.3
Private Junior	2.1	1.5	1.6	1.6	1.7	+ 0.2

* Adjusted to exclude institutions not responding and/or providing projections.

Table 6

SOURCES OF EXPECTED ENROLLMENT INCREASES:
Comparative Rankings

Overall Rank	Source	Ranks Public, Sr.	USC-Two	TEC	Privates
1	black students	1	3	2	1
2	part-time	2	1	1	2
3	non-traditional age	-	2	5	3
4	traditional age	3	4	3	4
5	full-time	4	5	4	5
6	transfer from 2-year colleges	5	-	-	7
7	white students	-	-	6	6
8	women	-	-	7	-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

School/College Collaboration -- An Action Agenda for South Carolina

> Today, with all the talk about educational excellence, schools and colleges still live in two separate worlds. Presidents and deans rarely talk to principals and district superintendents. College faculty do not meet with their own counterparts in public schools, and curriculum reform at every level are planned in isolation. It's such a simple point -- the need for close collaboration -- and yet it is a priority that has been consistently ignored (Boyer, 1985).

INTRODUCTION

In December 1990, the Council of College Presidents recommended that collaboration between K-12 and higher education institutions be studied as part of the statewide planning process. The Task Force on K-12/Higher Education Collaboration was formed in January 1991 with a membership comprised of four institutional representatives and four Commission on Higher Education (CHE) staff members. Specifically, the members of the Task Force are John Arnold, Dean, USC-Lancaster; Jimmie Cook, Dean, School of Education, USC-Spartanburg; Robert Day, Coordinator of Academic Programs, CHE; Joseph Heyward, Vice President for College Activities, Francis Marion College; Albert Lyles, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, Winthrop College; Robert Poch (Chairman), Assistant to the Commissioner, External Affairs, CHE; John Sutusky, Associate Commissioner for Facilities, CHE; and, Aileen Trainer, Coordinator of Academic Programs, CHE.

To investigate the issue of collaboration between K-12 and higher education institutions, the Task Force selected as the comprehensive theme for the study education as a "seamless web" and related to that theme collaborative issues that are important for consideration in South Carolina. Those issues and the comprehensive theme of the study are described and explored below.

The discussion and recommendations that follow are based upon a review of the literature on educational collaboration and the free exchange of information and ideas among Task Force members. The Task Force report is not intended as a comprehensive study of collaboration in South Carolina nor should the recommendations contained in the report be viewed as a final word on collaborative activities that should take place in the State. Indeed, the newly created South Carolina Council on Educational Collaboration will further explore collaborative efforts and new opportunities for collaboration in the months and years to come.

THE PROBLEM

"...the first years of formal schooling are crucial...each level of learning depends upon the other, and...if students make a poor beginning, prospects for future academic progress are diminished. Education is a seamless web" (Boyer, 1983). A "seamless web implies that education is a continuum, that one level is coherently and inextricably tied to the other. While that view of the "seamless web" is desirable, the reality speaks of a different set of circumstances. Education has never been continuous in this country. Certainly, there are pre-school, early childhood, elementary, middle, junior high, and high school education centers that lead to higher education for some, but to view them as a continuous flow with one building upon the other is grossly inaccurate.

There are discrete units of education as indicated above and those teaching within one area seldom know what the others are about. One hears teachers of young children stating that high school teachers do not understand the children they have so lovingly nurtured and high school teachers arguing that the children have been taught nothing of value during their first years of school. College faculty have less knowledge about what is happening in K-12 institutions and readily criticize high school teachers for the real or imagined ignorance of their students. Many act as if they bear no responsibility for what has happened before. There is a tendency to see each area in the educational process as someone else's responsibility. It is a deplorable situation that must be eradicated if South Carolina is to become the leader in education it has said it wants to be.

This is not a South Carolina problem, per se. It is national in scope. Not one of the fifty states has a planned program of integration of its educational system from pre-school through higher education. However, there is no reason for South Carolina to be cowed by the situation. Indeed, it can be the first state to responsibly, and dramatically, begin the initial step to bring a cohesive, planned marriage between the different levels of education.

DEFINITION OF SCHOOL-COLLEGE COLLABORATION

A survey of the research literature in education suggests that Boyer's observation that schools and colleges still live in "separate worlds" is accurate. Prior to 1980, with the notable exception of programs such as the Progressive Education Association's Eight Year Study, Goodlad's League of Cooperating Schools and the Teacher Corps, researchers report few systematic working connections between schools and colleges (Porter, 1987; Goodlad and Sirotnik, 1988). The identification of such efforts is made difficult by the lack of consistent terminology used to describe programs involving schools and colleges. Such terms as

partenerships, collaboration, consortium, network, cluster, interorganizational agreement collective, and cooperation have been used "frequently without definition and often without distinguishing [a] chosen descriptor from other possible terms" (Clark in Goodlad and Sirotnik, 1988). Clift et al. (1990) define school-college collaboration "...as the explicit agreement among two or more persons to meet together over time to set and accomplish a particular set of goals. The collaborators consist of practitioners and researchers from diverse role groups...."

For the purpose of this paper a definition of school-college collaboration synthesized from those discussed above will be used.

> School-college collaboration is a term applied to a broad range of efforts aimed at achieving, to mutual satisfaction, program improvement through the development of relationships between individual K-12 schools or school districts and colleges.

SCHOOL-COLLEGE COLLABORATION: A RECENT HISTORY

In the 1980's following the publication of A Nation at Risk (U.S. Department of Education, 1983), several organizations through various official reports called for the reform of public education in the United States and its system for preparing classroom teachers. Among the many recommendations for reform listed in these reports is a call for school-college collaboration. Authors of Academic Preparation for College (The College Board, 1983), argued that the Educational Equality Project "[would] mobilize...assistance for high schools by fostering collaborative efforts with colleges...." Goodlad, in A Place Called School, argues that teachers need "...immersion in behavioral and humanistic studies [and] guided by observation and practice only in key and demonstration schools working in collaboration with the teacher preparing institutions" (quoted in Gross and Gross, 1985). In An Urgent Imperative (American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 1986), delegates to the Wingspread Conference on Teacher Preparation listed "strengthening relationships with local school districts" as one of eight categories of program excellence in teacher preparation.

Despite these calls for school-college collaboration, little has been done. A sampling of current research concerning collaboration with public schools fails to yield common categories of participants, common motivational factors, similar goals, comparable sources of funding, or parallel outcomes. Rather, what is presented is a variety of collaborative efforts, proposed by a variety of individuals or groups for a variety of reasons, with an assortment of results. No consistent format, structure, or congruous purpose defines these collaborative efforts. The picture is one of differing projects, frequently

conceived and implemented by individuals with a local interest or purpose as opposed to a structured and coordinated effort at collaboration at the district, county or state levels.

Rare instances of concern for curricular reform occur when individuals express the need for revision. There is little evidence to support that this is a frequent happening and it starts as often at the public school level as it does in higher education (Kelly, 1988; East et al., 1989; Cook and Schuhmann, 1990).

Other efforts at school-college collaboration have resulted from the many studies that have reported on the poor condition of the study of science and mathematics in this country. There have been several of these, all reporting remarkable successes, but, they too, are the result of concerns expressed by individual colleges or public schools (Moses, 1989; Norwick and Brisbois, 1989; Musselman, 1989; Bozelli, 1988).

BENEFITS OF SCHOOL-COLLEGE COLLABORATION

Important benefits accrue from successful school-college collaboratives. The literature suggests numerous benefits from cooperative efforts between a university's faculty and the K-12 faculty of an urban school district to improve the teaching of writing (Cronnell et al., 1982; Brunetti, 1981) to programs initiated by schools and colleges to improve the graduation rates of minority students and "at-risk" students (Cage, 1991; Ascher, 1989; Arciniega, 1980). Moreover, there have been recent efforts on the part of teacher education faculty to strengthen the ties between themselves and the schools that serve as sites for student teaching and other field experiences in order to improve the preparation of teachers (Griffin, 1983; Ward and Tikunoff, 1982; Davis, 1982; Meir and Edington, 1982; Richards, 1980).

Successful collaboratives force schools and colleges to recognize the inseparable, interconnected stake of both parties in educating the American population and in preparing the teachers who will lead education efforts. According to Goodlad,

> the argument for school-university partnerships proceeds somewhat as follows. For schools to get better, they must have better teachers, among other things. To prepare better teachers (and counselors, special educators, and administrators), universities must have access to schools using the best practices. To have the best practices, schools need access to new ideas and knowledge. This means that universities have a stake in school improvement just as schools have a stake in the education of teachers (quoted in Goodlad and Sirotnik, 1988).

Gross (1988) summarizes benefits to schools and colleges in collaborative arrangements. The benefits include: fiscal savings, improving professionalism for teachers, freedom from bureaucracy, establishing personal ownership over the educational agenda, achieving integration with the college or university, enhancing facilities, networking, engendering community support, and improving prestige of superintendents, principals, and teachers. For colleges collaboratives increase opportunities for recruitment, strengthen the funding base, shape educational goals, improve faculty compensation, enhance pedagogical and curricular interaction, reveal teachers as motivated students, provide research opportunities, and provide education leadership to the community.

Without question, however, the most important and meaningful benefit of school-college collaboration is the improvement of student learning and development. Dialogue between K-12 and higher education faculty members and administrators, and the exchange of ideas on pedagogy and curriculum should always have as a central purpose the improvement of student learning. The Task Force recognizes and applauds the establishment of the South Carolina Council on Educational Collaboration which consists of educators from the public and private sectors of South Carolina's educational community working together to provide a general direction for K-12/higher education collaboration and also to seek, secure, and monitor funds for collaborative efforts. If managed correctly, these Council functions can go far toward improving student learning and development throughout the State.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Task Force on K-12/Higher Education Collaboration recommends that the South Carolina Council on Educational Collaboration take a national lead in this significant movement, and toward that end, makes recommendations that can be implemented immediately by public and private schools, universities, and colleges. The Task Force recommends that:

1. As a standard, public schools, colleges, and universities should develop collaborative programs that encourage teachers and prospective teachers to experience diversity within student populations. Such diversity is not necessarily restricted to race but may also include socioeconomic and cultural diversity.

2. Higher education institutions and schools should create opportunities for academic alliances to form among teachers of the same subjects. Many of our junior high and senior high schools have subject area specialists in mathematics, science and the humanities. However, these individuals may have little idea about what their higher education counterparts are doing nor may higher education faculty know much about K-12 education. The creation of special programs where local college or university and K-12 personnel could meet in job-alike sessions

several times during a year could go far in allowing each to understand the other and would eventually spawn ideas for more serious collaboration (Silber, 1989).

3. There should be a conscious effort to encourage faculty exchanges between local colleges or universities and public or private schools (even for short periods of time) when faculty at either educational level express an interest in broadening their experience. This recommendation has been carried out successfully by schools of education. Other faculty in higher and public education should be encouraged to investigate the possibilities inherent in such opportunities.

4. Cooperative research should be encouraged between higher education and school faculty. While this is not for everyone, there are sizeable numbers of faculty at both levels who would participate if encouraged (Musselman, 1989).

5. Graduate Programs within the State should require community service for all students regardless of academic discipline. To begin this process, the Task Force recommends the implementation of pilot programs that involve graduate students in educationally-related community services. Programs of this kind generally are cost effective and can make contributions to public and private schools (Norwick and Brisbois, 1989).

6. All colleges and universities should be encouraged to develop a community service component for all undergraduate degrees. This requirement could be met by students volunteering to do work in local elementary and high schools for specified periods of time under the direction of the faculty of the host school (Cahoon, 1989). Programs of this nature would represent a departure form the usual behavior of higher education institutions. Such activities generally have been left to schools of education to carry out. This assumes that a liberal arts or science major has nothing to offer to the public schools nor has any interest in being involved in local schools. This is a dangerous conclusion. All college students have the potential to make important contributions in the public schools (Norwich and Brisbois, 1989).

7. Public school students with special interests as well as moderate achievers should be given the opportunity to participate in specific college or university programs, especially summer offerings. The Task Force recommends further that it be incumbent upon the colleges and universities to ensure that such opportunities exist. Programs for the gifted and talented as well as moderate achievers of any age have demonstrated the impact that such programs can have on pre-college age students (Whelan, 1989; Cook and Schuhmann, 1990; Suss, 1989).

8. Parental involvement should be an integral part of the educational process. It is recommended that citizen advisory committees on K/12 - higher education be developed with

membership representative of the socio-economic and racial compostition of the geographic areas served by the committees. All committeees formed to seek collaboratives should include citizens who live in the community but do not necessarily have a tie to a public school or university.

9. The Commissioner of Higher Education and the Superintendent of Education in South Carolina should be encouraged to appoint a key staff member in their respective agencies whose primary duty will be working with local school districts and higher education institutions in facilitating opportunities for collaboration.

The above are immediate recommendations of the Task Force. Others will come to the fore once a program is inaugurated. It suggests a legitimate beginning and all interested forces within the State should bring their expertise to the table and initiate selected activities. Many of these ideas (as well as others) could be implemented within one year without disruption to local schools or universities.

Further ideas will emerge following a careful review of collaborative projects in place already in public and private schools, colleges, and universities throughout the State. Responses to a survey distributed by the Task Force to public and private colleges and universities in South Carolina are being used to compile a descriptive catalog of collaborative programs that exist now in South Carolina (a copy of the survey is attached). Once complete, a copy of the descriptive catalog will be given to the South Carolina Council on Educational Collaboration.

Is honest school-collaboration possible? If the leadership of the State is willing to set it as a priority, then other constituencies will follow. University and college presidents will need to hone the details of any undertaking with their faculty. Public school officials will need to pay attention to a reward structure for ambitious teachers who wish to become involved at the local levels. Political and business support will be necessary. Politics and business are powerful forces on the American landscape and their support is an absolute necessity.

The Task Force asserts that the above plan can positively influence the educational structure of the state. Further, it is posited that such an undertaking, implemented with skill and daring, can lead to substantive change in the quality of instruction in higher education and the public schools in South Carolina.

SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION
1333 MAIN STREET
SUITE 300
COLUMBIA, S. C. 29201

FRED R. SHEHEEN
Commissioner

TELEPHONE
803/253-6260

FAX NUMBER
803/253-6267

March 12, 1991

MEMORANDUM

TO: Chief Academic Officers, South Carolina Public and Private Colleges and Universities

FROM: Task Force on K-12/Higher Education Collaboration

The Council of College Presidents selected collaboration between K-12 schools and higher education institutions as one of three topics for inclusion in the first statewide higher education planning document. A Task Force on K-12/Higher Education Collaboration comprised of selected institutional representatives and Commission on Higher Education staff was formed to investigate the topic. A list of Task Force members is enclosed.

As part of its study on educational collaboration, the Task Force is requesting information from South Carolina post-secondary institutions on collaborative efforts in place currently. This information will enable the Task Force to create a descriptive catalog of collaborative efforts and to understand the characteristics of those efforts more fully.

Task force members request that you distribute the enclosed copies of the questionnaire with this cover letter to those individuals at your institution who are involved in collaborative programs or projects with K-12 schools. We ask that one questionnaire be used for each individual collaborative project or program. Please remember that such collaborative programs often take place outside of a department, school, or college of education. The Task Force also requests that any additional descriptive information available on collaborative programs at your institution be enclosed with the completed questionnaires. Your response by March 29, 1991 will be appreciated.

Please forward the completed questionnaires and any further pertinent descriptive information to:

Dr. Robert Poch
Assistant to the Commissioner, External Affairs
South Carolina Commission on Higher Education
1333 Main Street, Suite 300
Columbia, S. C. 29201

We look forward to your response and appreciate your cooperation.

Enclosures

cc: Presidents, Public and Private Colleges and Universities
Dr. James R. Morris, Jr.
Mr. Sterling L. Smith

TASK FORCE ON K-12/HIGHER EDUCATION COLLABORATION

Members

Commission on Higher Education Staff:

Dr. Robert K. Poch, Chair
Assistant to the Commissioner,
External Affairs

Dr. Robert A. Day
Coordinator of Academic Programs

Dr. John C. Sutusky
Associate Commissioner, Facilities

Dr. Aileen C. Trainer
Coordinator of Academic Programs

Institutional Representatives:

Mr. John R. Arnold
Dean
USC-Lancaster

Dr. James E. Cook
Dean of Education
USC-Spartanburg

Dr. Joseph E. Heyward
Vice President, Student Affairs
Francis Marion College

Dr. Albert M. Lyles
Acting Vice President for Academic Affairs
Winthrop College

Task Force on K-12/Higher Education Collaboration

Questionnaire

Institution: _____

Title of Collaborative Program: _____

Date Program was Established: _____

K-12 Grade levels involved in Program (i.e., grades 6-8, etc.): _____

Name of School involved in Collaborative Program:

_____ Public/Private: _____

Name of Collaborative Project Contact Person: _____

Title: _____

Phone #: _____

****

1. List the purposes and/or goals of the collaborative program:

2. Describe the distinctive features of the program:

3. Identify the unit (i.e., school, district, academic department, etc.) that initiated the program:

4. Does the collaborative program receive financial support? (Yes / No)
Amount:_____ Source:_____

5. What program features or characteristics have worked well in this particular collaborative program?

6. What difficulties or obstacles have you had to overcome? What would you do differently?

7. What, in your opinion, are the most important collaborative issues that need to be addressed in South Carolina?

8. Please attach any pertinent descriptive information about the collaborative program (i.e., brochures, pamphlets, etc.) to this questionnaire.

PLEASE RETURN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE TO YOUR CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICER BY MARCH 26. THANK YOU.

WORKS CITED

Arciniega, T. (1980). "Institutionalizing Bilingual Education in Colleges of Education," Paper presented at the AERA Annual Meeting, (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 198 987)

Ascher, C. (1989) "School-College Collaboration: A Strategy for Helping Low Income Minorities," THE URBAN REVIEW, 21:3, 181-191.

American Association of State Colleges and Universities. AN URGENT IMPERATIVE, Washington, DC: AASCU, 1986. *

Bauch, J. (1990). "The Transparent School: A Partnership for Parent Involvement. EDUCATION HORIZONS: 68:4, 187-89.

Boyer, E. (1983) HIGH SCHOOL, NY: Harper & Row. *

Boyer, E. (1985) "The Need for School-College* Collaboration," HIGHER EDUCATION AND NATIONAL AFFAIRS, September 2, p.11.

Bozzelli, J. et al. (1988). "Research Experiences for High School Science Groups: A Model for Collaboration Between High Schools and Colleges." JOURNAL OF CHEMICAL EDUCATION, 65:8, 705-707.

Bruner, J.(1963). TOWARD A THEORY OF INSTRUCTION. NY: Norton and Norton.

Brunetti, G. (1981), "Recent Trends in Inservice Education and Their Implications for the College Protessor with Particular Reference to the Teaching of Writing," Paper presented at the Conference on English Education Annual Meeting. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 203 347)

Cage, Mary Crystal. (1991, March 13), "Phoenix Program Seeks to Battle State's Daunting High School Dropout Rate," THE CHRONICLE OF HIGHER EDUCATION, A21, A28.

Cahoon, P. (1989). "Ambassadors: Model for At-Risk Students." EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP, 46:5, 64.

Clift, R. et al. (1990) "Restructuring Teacher Education* Through Collaborative Action Research," JOURNAL OF TEACHER EDUCATION, 41:2, 52-62.

Coble, L. et al. (1988). "This Systemwide Partnership Program Earns Goodwill and Great Donations,: AMERICAN SCHOOL BOARD JOURNAL, 175:8, 34-37. *

Cook, J. and A. Schuhmann. (1989) "Increasing Minorities in Teacher Education," Paper Presented at the AACTE Annual Meeting.

The College Board, (1983). ACADEMIC PREPARATION FOR COLLEGE, NY: College Entrance Examination Board. *

Creel, A. (1990). "Teaching the Teachers: A University Public School Partnership." SOCIAL EDUCATION, 54:5, 291-293.

Cronnell, B. et al. (1982) COOPERATIVE INSTRUCTIONAL APPLICATION OF WRITING RESEARCH, FINAL REPORT, Southwest Regional Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 240 585)

Davis, B. (1982) "Field Experience: What Is It? Why Is It Out There?" (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 221 531)

East, W. B., Frazier, J.M. and Mathews, L. E., (1989). Assessing the Physical Fitness of Elementary School Children. JOURNAL OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION, RECREATION AND DANCE, 60(6), 54-56.

Goodlad, John I. (1990), TEACHERS FOR OUR NATION'S SCHOOLS, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass Publishers.

_____ and K. Sirotnik, eds. (1988) SCHOOL-UNIVERSITY* PARTNERSHIPS IN ACTION, NY, TEACHERS COLLEGE PRESS.

GRIFFIN, G. (1983), "Interactive Research and Development on Schooling: Antecedents, Purposes, and Significance for School Improvement," Paper presented at the AERA Annual Meeting. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 2234 024)

Gross B. and R. Gross. (1985) THE GREAT SCHOOL DEBATE, NY: Simon and Schuster. *

Gross, T. (1988) PARTNERS IN EDUCATION, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Huebner, T., B. R. Avelar-LaSalle, and M. Azevedo. (1989) "Integrating Language Education, Teacher Training and University School Collaboration: A Pilot Project." THE MODERN LANGUAGE JOURNAL. 73(1) 23.

Kelly, L. (1988). "Curriculum Design Model: A Public School Cooperative Model for Designing a District-Wide Elementary Physical Education Curriculum." JOURNAL OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION, RECREATION, AND DANCE. 59:6, 26-32

Lawlor, J. (1989). "This School-College Team Scores a Win for City Kids," AMERICAN SCHOOL BOARD JOURNAL, 176:1, 36:

Meier, E. and E. Edington. (1982). "Research Synthesis: Teacher Preparation for Rural Schools." (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 222 312)

Moses, R. et al.(1989) "The Algebra Project: Organizing in the Spirit of Ella. HARVARD EDUCATIONAL REVIEW, 59:4, 423-43.

Musselman, R. et al. (1989) "High School-College Research Collaboration," JOURNAL OF CHEMICAL EDUCATION, 66:8, 653-656.

Nowick, J. and R. Brisbois. (1989) "The MIT Chemistry Outreach Program," JOURNAL OF CHEMICAL EDUCATION, 66:8, 666.

Ornstein, A. and D. Levine. (1989). FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Porter, A. (1987). "Teacher Collaboration: New Partnerships Attack Old Problems," PHI DELTA KAPPAN, 69:2, 147-152.

Richards, L. (1980). "Cooperative Relationships in Preservice and Inservice." A report prepared for AERA. Division H. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 195 548)

Silber, E. and T. Moore. (1989). "Academic Alliances: School College Faculty Collaboratives." FOREIGN LANGUAGE ANNALS, 22:3, 295.

Suss, S. and R. Goldsmith. (1989). "College Now Program: Successful Transition for Moderate Achievers." COLLEGE TEACHING, 37:3, 141.

United State Department of Education. (1983). A NATION AT* RISK, Washington, DC: U>S> Government Printing Office.

Ward, B. and W. Tikunoff. (1982) "Collaborative Research." Paper presented at the Research on Teaching National Invitational Conference. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 221 531).

Whelan, R. and F. Espinoza. (1989) "A High School-College Cooperative Program in Advanced Placement Physics Laboratory." THE PHYSICS TEACHER, 27:31, 182.

Wischorn, M. (1988). "City University of New York Middle College High School Helps Troubled Youths, Serves as Model Program." CHRONICLE OF HIGHER EDUCATION, 34:38, 37-38

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Wolfe, D. et al. (1989). "A Gateway to Collaboration: Clinical Faculty Programs," ACTION IN TEACHER EDUCATION, 11:2, 66-69.

Zapata, J. (1988). "Early Identification and Recruitment of Hispanic Teacher Candidates." JOURNAL OF TEACHER EDUCATION, 39:1, 19-23.

Final Report from Quality Incentives Task Force

Background

The Quality Incentives Task Force has met regularly since its inception on February 12, 19, 26, March 5 and 11, and April 18.

Members of the task force were Dr. David Maxwell, Clemson University; Mr. Floyd Tyler, College of Charleston; Dr. Ed Jackson, South Carolina State College; Dr. David Bell, University of South Carolina-Columbia; and Mssrs. John Smalls and Alan Krech and Drs. Jeanette Deas and Gail Morrison of the Commission staff. Dr. Morrison chaired the task force. Dr. Conrad Festa, College of Charleston; Dr. Rick Skinner, Lander College; Ms. Noel Morton, University of South Carolina-Columbia; and Mr. Jeff Richards, CHE staff, attended various committee meetings as guests.

The Committee on Quality Incentives recognized both the importance and the difficulty of its charge to examine approaches to funding higher education which would take into consideration certain performance indicators rather than rely on a funding mechanism that is primarily enrollment-driven. The Committee agreed that any program of quality incentives must recognize not only demonstrable ingredients of quality but must also reward significant improvements for institutions of different types, levels of development, and missions as they move upwards along the continuum toward higher levels of quality.

The Committee also recognized that there is considerable public interest in assessing and measuring quality as evidenced by the many publications in the popular press of ratings of institutions. These are said to be based on evaluations of a wide array of attributes such as institutional reputation, selectivity, faculty resources, financial resources and student satisfaction surveys. The fact that the State's public institutions in cooperation with the Commission on Higher Education have already adopted and implemented a comprehensive plan for measuring, and improving, institutional effectiveness is a compelling testimony to the fact that the public institutions are absolutely committed to strengthening their performance across a broad array of quality indicators.

Discussion

The Committee agreed that there are many different dimensions to quality, including faculty, students, programs, and resources. The range of elements that factor into improved quality is so complex, and those elements are in fact so interwoven, that the Committee accepted as a given the fact that no program of "quality incentives," no matter how attractive, can substitute for "full formula funding" as the single most effective, and efficient, way to improve substantially the quality of the State's public institutions.

At the same time, however, the Committee also recognized that the drive toward making significant improvements in quality cannot be postponed until the restoration of "full formula funding," which does not appear to be imminent. Thus, the Committee recognized that, despite the difficulties

in forging a consensus as to what significant quality indicators might be suitable with which to link funding, the quest for a funding mechanism which does not rely primarily on enrollment but which rewards achievement and significant improvements in performance is vital. In addition, there may well be significant public relations and marketing value, beyond the substantive impact of the development of such a program, to be accrued through the development of a package of "quality incentives." These might be expected to have a beneficial effect on full formula funding by restoring public and legislative confidence in higher education and in the funding process, if and where these have been eroded, and could conceivably create support for greater priority for higher education in a competitive funding environment.

A program of quality incentives that might be successful in this regard would in all likelihood focus on a clearly articulated set of priorities and values, such as improved undergraduate teaching, about which there would be broad consensus among institutions, the public, the Commission, and State policymakers.

The Committee divided its deliberations into two major segments: 1) development of a program of "quality incentives" and a formulaic methodology for including these incentives in the funding formula and 2) a program of "quality incentives" to be funded outside the formula at an appropriate time which would be complementary to those "Cutting Edge" measures already in existence.

Within the formula, the Committee agreed that a program of "quality incentives" might be composed of a number of items that have an effect on quality. Among many possible incentives mentioned were items such as retention of students; the percentage of accredited programs of those eligible for accreditation; numbers of students exiting remedial programs who complete entry-level curriculum courses; enrollment and graduation rates of other-race students; increases in minority faculty and staff; and percentage of lower-division courses taught by full-time faculty. Among the many possible incentives discussed were several that are included in the South Carolina institutional effectiveness program.

The Task Force noted that the decision to use "quality indicators" that are already a part of the institutional effectiveness program should be very carefully considered. Institutions that are readily identifying areas for improvement through the current effectiveness program may be less eager to do so if funding is tied to positive findings. In his paper "Designing State Incentive Programs That Work in Higher Education," John Folger acknowledges the good things about the Tennessee quality incentive funding program, but concludes, "The program hasn't lead (sic) to sufficient rewards at the faculty level on most campuses. The program also hasn't provided the kind of assessment evidence that will be of most help in planning and conducting an ongoing improvement effort."

The Committee agreed that prior to recommending for consideration a package of quality incentives for funding purposes, it was necessary to have a funding methodology in place, presumably to ascertain the feasibility of implementing such a program but also to enable each institution to determine what impact the proposed package would have on its

own funding. The Committee agreed that while institutions might experience different results with any single item in the package, the whole group of items to be selected should attempt to be as fair and equitable as possible in their totality.

Dr. Maxwell proposed a methodology for incorporating quality incentives within the formula which he labelled "A Semi-Generic Model" and which uses student retention as an example of one quality incentive to which the methodology might be applied (Attachment I). It is predicated upon the designation of a specific achievement goal and then a) rewarding achievement at that level or beyond and b) rewarding improvements toward the desired level. The Task Force endorsed the "Semi-Generic Model" as an appropriate starting point for the development of a mechanism for funding quality indicators.

The Committee also considered ideas for "quality incentives" that might be rewarded through funding outside of the formula, at some appropriate time. Two pressing needs were identified: 1) the need to improve the calibre of teaching and learning by strengthening the pedagogical skills of the instructional faculty and 2) the need to find some mechanism whereby the Commission would be able to obtain funding with which to provide state-level matching support for institutions submitting federal grant proposals. Such support would complement the required institutional match and enhance the competitiveness of our institutions. No specific mechanism was proposed for consideration by the Committee to accomplish this end.

However, a project to address the first of these needs was submitted by Dr. Conrad Festa. This project would establish a three-year statewide teaching/learning and curriculum development program to improve teaching and learning in the public institutions (Attachment II). The major functions of the program would be to provide a summer institute on teaching and learning for faculty; offer grants for seminars and workshops on enhancing teaching and learning to be conducted on campuses during the school year; and provide grants for curriculum reforms that would improve students' performance abilities. Estimated cost was $1.5 million. The Task Force endorsed this proposal.

Recommendations

The Task Force recommends:

1. That a Quality Incentives Committee be appointed to further refine and develop a proposed package of quality indicators to which the "Semi-Generic Methodology" might be applied for funding purposes as a new step in the funding formula;

2. The the Quality Incentives Committee be composed of three chief academic officers, three chief business officers, and three members of the Commission staff.

3. That the Quality Incentives Committee evaluate the following 12 quality indicators for inclusion under the proposed methodology:

a. retention rates (e.g., freshman to sophomore; other race students)

b. percentage of eligible programs that are accredited

c. graduation rates

d. percentage of students completing developmental study programs who succeed in regular programs

e. percentage of minority (other race) students, faculty, and staff

f. percentage of undergraduate students participating in faculty research programs

g. percentage of full-time faculty teaching lower-division programs

h. performance of students on required licensing and certification examinations

i. percentage of students who pursue graduate study

j. percentage of students from two-year college transfer programs who pursue baccalaureate study

k. student development indices

l. percentage of students and faculty who receive national awards (e.g., Fulbrights, Rhodes, NEH, NSF, Woodrow Wilson, Truman, etc.)

4. That a package of up to twelve quality indicators be selected for application to the "Semi-Generic Methodology" and that institutions be allowed to select a set number from among them (e.g., five) for funding purposes to be used over a predetermined period of time (e.g., five years) so that the package of quality indicators could be reflective of the differences among institutional types, levels of development, missions, and other distinguishing characteristics among institutions;

5. That the proposal for a teaching/learning and curriculum development program be commended favorably to the institutional Presidents and be funded outside the formula and from existing sources until such time as the Commission on Higher Education can consider incorporating funding for such a program under the "Cutting Edge" grants program; and

6. That a vehicle be established at the Commission on Higher Education which would enable the Commission to raise and distribute funds as match money for federal grant programs in order to enhance the competitiveness of South Carolina's public institutions in obtaining extramural funding, which is a traditional quality indicator.

21-Feb-1991

Examples of Formula Quality Incentives

I. Above the Benchmark Freshman to Sophomore Retention Rate

Institution "A" has a freshman to sophomore retention rate that is above the benchmark rate. The example below assumes that the benchmark retention rate is 65%. Encompassing a "reward" to this institution for having an above the benchmark retention rate into the formula is, in actuality, quite simple. The steps are as follows:

a. Instructional cost per FTE student - this number is already in the formula (Step 17A). For purposes of this example, assume it to be $4,000.

b. Freshman to sophomore retention rate -
   1) The number of freshman who entered in the preceding Fall and who enrolled for 12 or more credit hours is in the formula for the preceding year (Step 17b.1). Let us assume it to be 2500.

   2) The number of those in b(1) who "survived" (i.e., who also enrolled in the most recent Fall). This is the only new data needed and I expect that we all have it. If not, we'll soon have to have it. So, for illustrative purposes suppose that 1875 of those enrolled in Fall '91 also enrolled for Fall '92.

c. Rate yielded - Dividing 1875 by 2500 yields a 75% retention rate for Institution "A."

d. Difference in rates - Subtracting the 65% benchmark rate from Institution "A"'s retention rate of 75% yields 10%.

e. Student equivalents above the benchmark - 10% of A's students are above the benchmark. So 10% of 1875 is 187.5.

f. Amount of incentive - If 15% of instructional cost per student (for those above the benchmark) is deemed reasonable then the incentive is 187.5 X .15 X $4,000 = $112,500.

102 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

II. **Below the Benchmark Freshman to Sophomore Retention Rate but Improving**

Institution B's freshman to sophomore retention rate is not high but the institution is working on the problem and believes that the fact that it is improving should be rewarded.

If we agree, implementation and inclusion within the formula is a very simple task.

1) Amount by which the benchmark retention rate is increasing - Assume that the benchmark retention rate of 65% was, in the preceding year 62%.

2) Percentage increase in the benchmark rate - Dividing the growth of 3% by 62% yields a percentage increase of 4.8%.

3) Percentage increase in Institution B's retention rate - Suppose that Institution B's retention rate increased from 50% to 55% yielding a percentage increase of 10% (5% ÷ 50%).

4) Difference in percentage increases - 10% - 4.8% gives a difference of 5.2%.

5) Student equivalents above the benchmark - If the number of "surviving" students is the same as in the preceding example (which implies a larger initial class) then 5.2% X 1875 yields 97.5 student equivalents of the amount that Institution B's percentage increase exceeds that of the benchmark.

6) Amount of incentive - If 15% of instructional cost per student (for those above the benchmark) is deemed reasonable then the incentive is: 97.5 X .15 X $4,000. = $58,500.

February 27, 1991

MEMORANDUM

To: Task Force on Quality

From: Conrad Festa, College of Charleston

Subject: Quality Incentive Program

I have tried to keep up with the progress of the three task forces which have been established to deal with Enrollment, School/College Cooperation, and Quality. Although much has yet to be done, there does seem to be a common theme emerging from what I've seen, and that is an over-reaching concern with greater participation of South Carolinians in higher education. Rick Skinner's paper titled "Work Undone, Work To Do" discusses participation in terms of problems and strategies inherent in a plan for access to higher education in South Carolina. In it, he suggests that there presently exists a problem between access to and success in higher education. I believe the South Carolina plan for quality in higher education can bridge the gulf between access and success and bring coherence to all three plans.

In this brief memo I will share a few related thoughts about education in South Carolina, present a rudimentary outline which suggests a plan for quality, and offer my best estimate of the cost of the quality program. Please excuse the sketchy nature of this memo, but I have not had the time to do a more detailed or complete job.

Here are some thoughts, not entirely at random but not very well ordered either:

Two Major Characteristics of Higher Education in South Carolina:

1. Enrollment in higher education is low by whatever scale you wish to use.
2. Achievement is low by whatever scale you wish to use.

What Can We Do to Improve Those Two Characteristics:

1. Cooperate and communicate and plan better with the Schools.
2. Plan better curricula which address the developmental needs of college students.
3. Teach better to the kinds of students we get.

What Is It We Want To Improve:

1. Access, 2. Enrollment, 3. Retention, 4. Achievement

How Can A Plan For Quality Unite and Improve Those Four Areas:

1. Quality in higher education begins with the quality of the instructional faculty and the pedagogical methods used by those faculty to take students from wherever they are to wherever they can get by virtue of hard work.
2. By focusing our program for quality on the improvement of teaching and learning, most particularly teaching the kinds of students we get from the South Carolina schools and at the freshman and sophomore level.
3. By focusing our program for quality on the improvement of curriculum to include the development of basic skills and thinking throughout.
4. By creating a unified, specific goal for quality which can be assessed in the terms of access, enrollment, retention, and achievement.

Is There a Need for Teaching/Learning and Curriculum Development:

1. Recent surveys reveal some interesting characteristics of faculty in higher education. In response to the increasing attention to undergraduate teaching, faculty are expressing great interest in teaching and learning development programs. Most faculty in higher education have never had any formal training in teaching, have little knowledge of the research on teaching in general and teaching in their own discipline, relate well to the idea of being a professional in their own discipline but not as a teacher, have never consciously set down a coherent philosophy of teaching, have not consciously related their philosophy of teaching and learning to their syllabi and classroom activities, are unfamiliar with current research on and theories of learning, and know very little about theory and practice of testing and measurements.
2. With only a few exceptions, faculty are not encouraged to examine and change their individual and institutional curricula to include objectives that go beyond the basic disciplinary matters.
3. With some major exceptions, most faculty are not offered incentives and resources to work seriously on pedagogical matters.

A Well Designed Three Year Statewide Teaching/Learning and Curriculum Development Program Will Measurably Improve the Quality of Higher Education in South Carolina:

1. Provide a summer institute on teaching and learning for faculty -- four sessions each summer, two weeks each session, maximum of thirty faculty at each session.
2. Provide grants for seminars and workshops on campuses during the school year for training in teaching and learning issues.
3. Provide grants for curriculum reforms that are designed to address student developmental needs in basic skills

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

and thinking -- especially reforms that move the students progressively forward from low levels to high levels over the four year period.

4. Publish teaching/learning materials in newsletters, a journal, in books, etc. (any or all) to be distributed faculty.
5. Evaluate at the end of each year. At the end of the second year prepare recommendations for change.